BUT WHERE ARE THEY GOING? REFINING OUR UNDERSTANDING OF VOLUNTARY

TURNOVER BY DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL AND

PROFESSIONAL CHANGE

by

SARA LYNN CURTIS

(Under the Direction of Lillian T. Eby)

ABSTRACT

Employee turnover is a complex behavior that researchers and practitioners alike have tried to understand and predict. Most emphasis has been on the antecedent side of the equation, identifying predictors or creating models that explain this behavior, with little focus on the criterion behavior itself. This study sought to determine if where one goes after leaving an organization should be integrated into models of turnover. Social exchange theory was used to separate six common antecedents of voluntary turnover into two categories. Perceived organizational support, coworker support, supervisor relationship quality, and role overload were identified as context-specific predictors and were hypothesized to be more strongly related to organizational change. Intrinsic job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion were identified as context-generic predictors and were hypothesized to be more strongly related to professional change. Using a sample of 1919 substance abuse treatment (SAT) professionals collected over 4 years, both predictive quantitative data and retrospective qualitative data were used to compare people who stayed in their organizations, people who left the organization but stayed in SAT, and people who left the SAT profession completely. The results from the survey data showed

that all predictors except coworker support were predictive of the hypothesized type of turnover when comparing people who turned over to people who stayed, and that intrinsic job satisfaction was significantly lower in professional changers than organizational changers. Exit interviews conducted by third-party researchers were coded for the main reasons employees left their organizations, and it was found that pay and benefits, heavy workloads, personal matters, lack of support from the organization, and ideological differences with the organization were the most commonly cited reasons. Comments about stress and burnout occurred more frequently by those who left the profession than those who stayed. These findings indicate that there are some differences in what leads one to change professions versus organizations, but more research needs to be done in this area.

INDEX WORDS: Employee Turnover, Voluntary Turnover, Substance Abuse Treatment,
                Qualitative Data, Perceived Organizational Support, Coworker Support,
                Supervisor Relationship Quality, Role Overload, Job Satisfaction, Burnout

BUT WHERE ARE THEY GOING? REFINING OUR UNDERSTANDING OF VOLUNTARY

TURNOVER BY DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL AND

PROFESSIONAL CHANGE

by

SARA LYNN CURTIS

B.A., Milligan College, 2001

M.MFT., Abilene Christian University, 2003

M.S., The University of Georgia, 2009

A DISSERTATION Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2012

BUT WHERE ARE THEY GOING? REFINING OUR UNDERSTANDING OF VOLUNTARY

TURNOVER BY DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL AND

PROFESSIONAL CHANGE

by

SARA LYNN CURTIS

Major Professor:	Lillian T. Eby
Committee:	Brian J. Hoffman
	Karl W. Kuhnert

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2012

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who have supported me along the way. First and foremost, I want to thank my parents for their support and encouragement over the entire course of my life. You have always believed in me and helped me believe that I could do whatever I set my mind to.

A special thanks must be given to a few people who helped me keep my sanity through this process. First, to my coworkers at The Leaders Lyceum who supported me 100% when the road got the toughest. Thank you for being flexible, encouraging, understanding, and entertaining, and for feeding me when I didn't think I'd have enough money to eat. To Rob Riggs, the most supportive boyfriend ever, whose response when I would feel like I was over my head was always, "What can I do to help?". And to my roommate and dear friend Becca Meloy, who kept me grounded with dancing movies, cooking experiments, morning walks, and craft time. You all are amazing.

There are several people in the Applied Psychology Program that deserve much thanks. I literally could not have done this project without the assistance and encouragement of Lillian Eby. Thank you for your support, guidance, and data! It has been such a great experience working with you. Additionally, I am indebted to my fellow students for all of the things I have learned from them. I'm honored to be able to study next to you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

Researchers and practioners alike have been interested in the topic of employee turnover

for decades. It is well understood that employee turnover is costly to organizations. Costs include

the financial burden of recruiting, hiring, and training new employees, loss of productivity,

increased administrative burdens, and employee demoralization for those who remain employed

(Eby & Rothrauff-Laschober, 2012; Hom & Griffeth, 1994). In professional service

organizations, turnover can also have negative consequences on the quality of services provided

because those services depend on the presence of qualified employees and continuity of care

(Ducharme, Knudsen, & Roman, 2008; Hom & Griffeth, 1994).

Most turnover research has focused on either the development of new models of how

turnover happens (e.g., Lee, Mitchell, Wise, & Fireman, 1996; March & Simon, 1958; Mobley,

1977) or identifying key predictors of this important behavior (e.g. Blau, 2000; Blau, 1985;

Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Each of these studies adds a valuable

piece of knowledge to the understanding of turnover. Despite the wealth of theory and research

that exists today, there is still much to be understood about turnover. Results vary widely from

study to study, and meta-analytic reviews indicate that there is a lot of variance yet to be

explained (Griffeth, et al., 2000). Specifically, in over half of the relationships between job

satisfaction, organization factors, and work environment factors with undifferentiated turnover

(no distinction between voluntary and involuntary turnover) in Griffeth and colleagues' meta-analysis (2000), the presence of moderators was indicated.

One possible explanation for this variability is the inconsistent ways in which the construct of turnover is measured and defined (Simon, Muller, & Hasselhorn, 2010). Collecting data on turnover behavior is difficult. Although automated human resource management systems are popular, not all organizations have such systems. This creates challenges in obtaining turnover data. Moreover, data may not always be systematically gathered and recorded, creating additional access problems. In addition, organizational representatives are often unaware that someone is planning on leaving the organization, so longitudinal designs with large samples are necessary to capture information from people before they turnover. It can also be difficult or impossible to track down individuals who have left the organization, which makes it hard to connect pre-turnover attitudes with reasons for turnover and post-turnover behavior.

These obstacles often limit the type of data that can be collected in studying turnover. When actual turnover data is not available, the intention to turnover is often used as a surrogate based on the theory of reasoned action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). These studies provide valuable information into the affective and cognitive processes leading up to turnover, but a comprehensive understanding of actual turnover behavior is missed. Meta-analytic findings show that the corrected correlation between turnover intentions and turnover behavior is only 0.45 (Griffeth, et al., 2000), indicating a significant amount of unexplained variance in turnover behavior. When actual turnover data is available, it can be collected from either organizational reports or from the employees themselves. These two sources are not always in agreement about the nature of the turnover (resignation vs. termination) or the reasons behind the turnover (why the person chose to leave; Campion, 1991). Additionally, many employees may not feel

comfortable telling their former employer the real reasons they left in order to not burn any bridges (Branham, 2005; Campion, 1991; Mobley, 1982). Therefore, the dependence on organizational reports can make it difficult for researchers to gain a reliable understanding of why people choose to leave there jobs. Organizations also do not often keep track of where former employees go after leaving, so it is difficult to study how turnover destination plays a role in the turnover process.

In addition to how turnover is measured, there are also differences in how turnover is conceptualized or defined. Turnover has been defined as "voluntary cessation of membership in an organization by an individual who receives monetary compensation for participating in that organization" (Hom & Griffeth, 1994, p. 4). However, this is not always how turnover is operationalized. In studies on turnover behavior, those who stayed in the organization are often compared to those who left. But as the definition states, an important element of turnover is *voluntariness*—those people who leave of their own volition are likely to be different from those dismissed for performance or budgetary reasons (Mobley, 1982). This variability in how turnover is operationalized may be contributing to the varying findings in turnover research (Campion, 1991). All of these challenges in how turnover is measured and operationalized make a fine-grained understanding of turnover difficult to achieve.

What is consistent across most work on turnover is that the focus is on the predictor side of the equation, revealing a "favoritism toward predictors" (Austin & Villanova, 1992). We have made more and more complicated models of turnover, but they are each still just predicting "turnover" and usually with little consideration of what is meant by that construct (Simon, et al., 2010). Very little time is spent defining the researcher's conceptualization of turnover and why they chose to define it that way. Sometimes, especially in mete-analytic work, it is not even

specified if the turnover being considered is voluntary, involuntary, or a combination of both (i.e. Griffeth, et al., 2000). Much more explanation is provided in regards to what the predictors are and why they are thought to be related to turnover. We should take note of the work that has been done in the study of performance (Austin & Villanova, 1992) and realize that we need to examine and expand our criteria as well as our predictors. In one of the seminal books on turnover, Hom and Griffeth (1994) state, "though overlooked, more accurate turnover classifications may well boost the explanatory power of predictor variables as much as the expansion of predictor batteries is expected to" (p. 6). While many researchers now restrict their definitions of turnover to voluntary departures (e.g. Harman, Lee, Mitchell, Felps, & Owens, 2007; Lee, et al., 1996), functional turnover (Dalton, Krackhardt, & Porter, 1981) or even occasionally organizationally-avoidable departures (Abelson, 1987; Dalton, et al., 1981), there is yet another important distinction in the realm of turnover that is rarely made: the distinction based on where the person goes after they leave.

Organizational turnover and professional turnover are regarded as distinct types of transitions (Blau, 2007; Louis, 1980). Organizational turnover is a more common occurrence (Blau, 2007; Fields, Dingman, Roman, & Blum, 2005) and involves making a change that is still relatively consistent with the career path the person has been on. The person will need to acclimate to the new organization's culture and practices and potentially learn new skills for this new position, but previous experience and training should essentially equip him or her for the job. On the other hand, professional turnover involves making a change that is not in line with typical career progression (Rhodes & Doering, 1983). Career change often involves a larger number of differences than organizational change. It has even been described as moving to a different culture where one must learn new language, norms, code of ethics, and even

professional self-identity (Louis, 1980). These factors make professional change a more complex transition than organizational change. Therefore, in order to better understand turnover, it is also important to take into account where a person goes after he or she leaves the organization (Fields, et al., 2005; Kirschenbaum & Weisberg, 2002).

To address this gap in the literature, this study seeks to further refine the criterion of voluntary turnover by making a distinction between organizational and professional turnover. Based in Social Exchange Theory (SET), it is proposed that different antecedents will drive these two types of turnover based on whether they are specific to the organization or generalized across the profession. Both quantitative survey data collected while participants are employed and qualitative data collected after voluntary departure from the organization will be used to gain better understanding of the reasons people leave their organizations and their professions.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

Social Exchange Theory

Social Exchange Theory (SET) is one of the most comprehensive and influential theories that has been proposed, and it is often used as the framework for research on organizational behavior. While "not all human behavior is guided by considerations of exchange, ...much of it is, more than we usually think" (Blau, 1964, p. 5). Blau's (1964) work provides an in-depth examination of the nature of social exchange, including how it develops and influences behavior. Associations between a person and another individual or a group develop out of the anticipation that a relationship will be rewarding. The more rewarding a relationship appears in comparison to alternatives, the stronger that association will be. The essence of a social exchange relationship is "voluntary actions of individuals that are motivated by the returns they are expected to bring and typically do in fact bring from others" (Blau, 1964, p. 91).

SET focuses on unspecified social commodities that are exchanged on the basis of providing something valuable to the other party, trusting that they will reciprocate with something valuable to the initial giver. These rewards can be tangible and have value apart from the relationship, such as gifts, advice, or assistance on a project, or they can more intangible and have value based more on what they represent about the relationship, such as respect, approval, and support. These social commodities that can be exchanged are distinctly different from the economic exchanges outlined in a contract. Relationships based on the exchange of social rewards are thought to be of higher quality than those strictly based on economic exchange

(Anand, Vidyarthi, Liden, & Rousseau, 2010). It is these voluntary social exchanges that are proposed to be what motivates someone to maintain a relationship.

Exchange is often thought of in terms of transactions between individuals such as in friendships and business relationships, but it also applies to associations between members of larger social entities who may or may not have direct contact with each other (Blau, 1964). There is a basic structure to the various entities with which an individual is associated (Blau, 1964), and a person is simultaneously in relationship with several, often nested, groups (Lawler, 1992). At the highest level exist macrostructures. These are collectives that unite large numbers of people or groups (e.g. professions). The nature of the exchange relationships between individuals and these larger macrostructures are slightly different than one-to-one relationships, but the principles behind them are the same. People are attracted to a group for various reasons and believe that membership in that group will be more rewarding than the alternatives. Because of the large number of people that can belong to a macrostructure and the separation between them, exchanges become more indirect and chains of transactions develop (Blau, 1964). Exchange relationships with macrostructures are based more on intangible than tangible rewards, and the exchanges are not always direct transactions between two parties. Within the macrostructure, there are numerous subgroups (e.g. organizations), of which the individual could choose to become a member, and within those subgroups are microstructures (individual relationships). Employees often personify the organization based on their interactions with key agents such as executives and supervisors (Levinson, 1965), making a relationship with certain people both a microstructure as well as a component of a relationship with a subgroup.

The person can and does have distinct exchange relationships at these different levels (Lawler, 1992). Additionally, it is possible to maintain the relationship with a macrostructure but

change the subgroups. Within the employment context, a person can remain in a given profession but change the organization within which this relationship is carried out. These permeable boundaries create opportunity for both organization and professional turnover.

When a person decides that it will be more rewarding to leave their current association, either with the organization or profession for another, turnover occurs. The question at hand, then, is how one decides if he or she should leave the subgroup (organization) or the macrostructure (profession). In order to make this decision, the individual needs to ascertain if the source of his or her reason for seeking a change is unique to the current organization or if it is characteristic of the entire profession. While a profession may purport shared values and standards, the specific organizations within that profession may differ in how they carry out these values due to limitations and competing responsibilities within that organization (Blau, 1964). For instance, most, if not all, all substance abuse treatment organizations would claim that freedom from addictions is one of their values. But while helping clients find recovery is their mission, they also have a goal of being fiscally responsible. At times, these commitments may conflict, causing an organization to take on more patients than the staff can handle, or be limited in the amount of care that can be provided because of insurance regulations. If an employee is particularly committed to the value of helping people recover form their addictions, he or she may not want to stay in an organization where it is believed that profitability comes before quality of care. This person may still want to invest in his or her relationship with the profession as a whole, but realize that his or her current organization is not providing the desired rewards and leave for a similar job in a different organization (organizational turnover). On the other hand, he or she may not be strongly committed to the profession's values and feel like this type of work is not providing worthwhile rewards. In this case, the person may abandon the

profession entirely for a different one that is anticipated to be more rewarding (professional turnover). With this in mind, we now turn to the distinction between organizational and professional turnover.

<div align="center">Organizational vs. Professional Turnover</div>

Turnover is most often studied in the context of who leaves the organization and why, but this assumes that the turnover process is the same for people who are leaving because they want to continue working in the same profession but in a different organization versus someone who wants to leave the profession altogether. Leaving a job is a major life decision, but leaving a profession is an even bigger decision which happens less frequently (Blau, 2007). Making the decision to leave a profession can be a difficult one. Career choice and development is a "long term process that is characterized by personal involvement and large investments" (van der Heijden, van Dam, & Hasselhorn, 2009, p. 618). The costs of leaving a profession can be great, and often include investments of time, money, and training, diminished social recognition, and loss of a sense of career identity (van der Heijden, et al., 2009). As a result, the choice to change professions is often more difficult and deliberate than other types of voluntary separation (Rhodes & Doering, 1993).

It is safe to assume that no company wants to lose talented employees, but this is especially true of organizations that employ "knowledge workers" (Micklethwait & Wooldridge, 1996). These are professional employees who add value to the organization not because of the labor they perform but because of the knowledge and experience they have (Lee & Maurer, 1997). Knowledge workers are characterized by qualities such as being experts in some knowledge base acquired over a period of time, identifying with their chosen profession and other members of that profession, feeling ethically responsible to help their clients, and valuing a

code of professional conduct. These are the employees that give a company a competitive advantage and "will largely determine which firms become the 'stars' and which firms become the 'has been's' in the twenty-first century" (Lee & Maurer, 1997, p. 248).

While organizations in the helping professions may not claim that their primary objective is to beat out the competition or be "stars", they want to retain employees in order to carry out the goal of providing quality care to patients (Rothrauff, Abraham, Bride, & Roman, 2011; van der Heijden, et al., 2009). Substance abuse treatment (SAT) is one such profession that employs knowledge workers. In order to properly assess clients in order to create appropriate treatment plans and provide treatment and prevention services (O*NET, 2010), SAT professionals need to have comprehensive knowledge of the complexities of addiction and the various methods of treatment. For this reason, SAT organizations are concerned about retaining their talented employees. Recent research has found voluntary turnover rates among SAT professional of 14.4% for clinical supervisors and 24.9% for counselors over a one year period (Eby, Burk, & Maher, 2010). While the rate for supervisors was slightly lower than the annual voluntary turnover rate of 16.4% in 2010 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011), the turnover rate of counselors was much higher. When the time period of the SAT study was extended to four years, 47% of counselors had voluntarily turned over (Eby & Rothrauff-Laschober, 2012). This indicates that turnover in this population is high enough to be of concern to treatment organizations.

In addition to the concern about organizational turnover, there is also a concern within the helping professions about professional turnover. The loss of a skilled employee to a completely different field is costly to the profession as a whole (Parry, 2008; Rothrauff, et al., 2011). More specifically, "occupational turnover, particularly among competent and experienced counselors, could be more detrimental to the SAT field than organizational turnover…[resulting

in] fewer knowledgeable counselors providing services to patients and supplying training, guidance, and mentorship to new counselors" (Rothrauff, et al., 2011, p. 68). Professional retention is crucial to establish a stable workforce that is equipped to provide high quality substance abuse treatment to patients (Ducharme, et al., 2008). Therefore, it is important to understand what leads an employee to leave the profession beyond the typical predictors of organizational turnover.

Very little research exists on this topic, but there is some preliminary evidence that there are different predictors of turnover based on where the person goes after he or she leaves the organization. One of the few studies that considered turnover destination separated turnover into the categories of same job-same company, different job-same company, same job-different company (similar to organizational turnover), and different job-different company (similar to professional turnover; Fields, et al., 2005). When looking at variables at the individual, job, and organization levels, they found different patterns of significant relationships across these groups. Differences in the significance of relationships were found when these more specific turnover classifications were used compared to overall turnover. Unfortunately, Fields and colleagues (2005) did not restrict their sample to voluntary departures or people in professional occupations. Two other studies have also found differential results when factoring in turnover destination, but they only measured turnover intentions rather than turnover behavior (Kirschenbaum & Weisberg, 2002; Simon, et al., 2010). Only one of these studies specifically looked at professional turnover among people employed in professional occupations (Simon, et al., 2010), and neither of these studies made any specific predictions or used any theory to explain why they anticipated different results (Kirschenbaum & Weisberg, 2002; Simon, et al., 2010).

Additionally, no study directly compared the turnover groups to each other, just to the people that did not turn over.

Despite these limitations, these studies point to the fact that turnover destination is important to take into consideration, and breaking apart turnover based on destination can result in different findings. What is a significant predictor of organizational turnover may not be related to professional turnover, and failure to differentiate types of turnover may lead to a loss of prediction (Fields, et al., 2005). The current study tackles this issue and addresses the limitations of these previous studies by examining the predictive power of six antecedents of turnover which are conceptually and theoretically aligned to either organization or professional turnover.

The precedent for differentiating between the organization and profession has been set in other areas of study. Researchers in the area of employee commitment have offered theory and research to show that commitment is a complex, multifaceted construct that can have distinct foci (i.e. organizations, unions, professions, workgroups; Cohen, 2003). While related, organizational and professional commitment were found to be distinct and contribute to attitudinal and behavioral outcomes independently (Cohen, 2000; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). Different foci of commitment can have differing levels of salience depending on the context, and these can either be in agreement or in conflict with one other. For example, an employee can be fully committed to the union, but not to the organization in which he or she works (Magenau, Martin, & Peterson, 1988). If employees can be committed to different foci which each have unique relationships with behaviors, it stands to reason that this same distinction between organizations and professions can be made in regards to turnover behavior.

Commitment research is not the only area where this distinction is made. Person-environment fit theory considers the compatibility between a person and one or more aspects of

his or her environment (Jansen & Kristof-Brown, 2006). Fit can be examined at different levels, including the occupation, organization, job, supervisor, and workgroup, and research finds that different dimensions of fit are differentially related to attitudinal and behavioral constructs (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). Research on job embeddedness also has begun distinguishing between different levels of the work domain. Feldman and Ng (2007) argue that job, organizational, and occupational embeddedness are conceptually distinct and propose that there are distinct factors that can result in someone being embedded in his or her profession while not being embedded in their organization. The differential findings across various streams of research support the argument that people are able to compartmentalize different aspects of their work context (Kristof-Brown, et al., 2005).

While these researchers have not offered theoretical arguments for why variables will have different relationships with the different foci of commitment, embeddedness, or fit, some similarities can be identified. In a meta-analysis on the outcomes of the various types of fit, a clear pattern emerged (Kristof-Brown, et al., 2005). The strongest correlations were found between corresponding levels of variables: job satisfaction and person-job fit, organizational commitment and person-organization fit, satisfaction with coworkers and person-group fit, and satisfaction with the supervisor and person-supervisor fit.

The importance of correspondence between variables has been found across numerous fields of research. Ajzen and Fishbein (1977) argue that the weak relationships that are often found between attitudes and behaviors are due in part to the lack of congruence between the variables. Furthermore, general attitudes are not very good predictors of specific behaviors, and specific attitudes are not very good predictors of general behaviors. Congruence of the attitude and the behavior in terms of the target and specificity of action, context and time influence the

strength of the association. This supports the findings in the fit literature discussed above, and guides the current theory of which variables will be more strongly associated with the different types of turnover.

It is proposed that this decision of where to go after leaving their current organization will be based on whether the source of discontent is unique to the organization (context-specific) or if it is likely to be the same in any organization within the same profession (context-generic). When faced with a choice involving multiple groups, a person will make a decision based on which party is believed to be responsible for the situation and the emotions produced in that situation (Lawler, 1992). In their model of career change, Rhodes and Doering (1983) acknowledge that in some professions, certain factors will be more closely attributed to the occupational as opposed to the organization. One example would be the physical demands of a construction worker. While some particular jobs may require more physical labor compared to others based on available equipment or nature of the task being done, this component of the work is not likely to change much by simply changing organizations. Therefore, construction workers would have to change careers if they want to reduce the amount of physical labor being done. On the other hand, if the worker does not get along with his or her supervisor, changing organizations would be enough to resolve that issue. This idea was supported in a study of union workers' commitment. The workers' perceptions of a union's decision-making were related only to their commitment to that union and not the organization (Magenau, et al., 1988).

Rather than using a context-specific attitude like satisfaction with coworkers to predict any type of turnover, increasing the congruence between the predictor and the type of turnover may reveal different results than what has been found in the past. Consequentially, context-specific factors are hypothesized to be more predictive of organizational turnover while the

context-generic factors are hypothesized to be more predictive of professional turnover. We now look at some of the more commonly studied antecedents of turnover to determine whether they represent context-specific or context-generic predictors.

<center>Context-Specific Antecedents of Turnover</center>

Much research has been conducted on the antecedents and correlates of organizational turnover. A study that investigated reasons for voluntary turnover uncovered an interesting discrepancy (Branham, 2005). Despite the fact that managers claim that the reason for turnover in 89% of the cases is pay, less than 12% of employees report this as the reason they left. Instead, most of the reasons given were based on emotional and relational factors that were within the organization's or supervisor's control. A large scale meta-analysis conducted by Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner (2000) found supporting results. Neither pay nor satisfaction with pay were significant predictors of undifferentiated turnover, but satisfaction with supervisors, co-workers, and the work itself were related to turnover. Additionally, measures of role stress (role clarity, role overload, role conflict, and overall stress) were also related to turnover. These significant predictors are all social rewards and costs whereas pay, an economic reward, was not a strong predictor of undifferentiated turnover. These findings speak to the importance of social commodities in the turnover decision.

This study will look at the role of several of these social rewards. Quality relationships and social support are powerful and important social rewards as they are sources of validation (Blau, 1964). Common sources of support include the organization, coworkers, and supervisors. These three types of supportive relationships are considered here as context-specific antecedents of turnover. After that, role overload, a type of role stress, will be considered.

Perceived organizational support. Like other exchange relationships, the employment relationship is reciprocal; employees offer their effort and commitment in exchange for anticipated economic and social rewards (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). One social reward that is anticipated by employees is the "assurance that aid will be available from the organization when it is needed to carry out one's job effectively and to deal with stressful situations" (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002, p. 698). This construct is referred to as perceived organizational support (POS), which is an employee's perception of the extent to which the organization cares about and values him or her. In response to feeling supported, the employee is obligated to reciprocate by caring for the organization and contributing to its objectives. One basic way to fulfill this obligation is to continue working for the organization.

Research supports the assertion that POS is negatively related to voluntary turnover and other withdrawal behaviors. A study that looked at the relationship between POS and voluntary turnover in two different professions found significant results for both groups ($r = -0.09$ and $r = -0.21$; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001). A meta-analysis, which did not differentiate voluntary from involuntary turnover, found a correlation of -0.11 (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Neither of these studies looked at whether the person was changing organizations or professions, which may be contributing to the small effect sizes. As indicated by the very name of the construct, POS is in reference to the specific organization rather than the larger profession. Because POS is an indication of a rewarding exchange relationship with the organization, it is hypothesized to be more predictive of organizational turnover than professional turnover.

Hypothesis 1a: People who voluntarily leave their organizations will report significantly lower levels of perceived organizational support than people who do not turn over.

Hypothesis 1b: People who voluntarily leave their organizations will report significantly lower levels of perceived organizational support than people who change professions.

Work relationships. It is not uncommon to hear the notion that "people make the place" (Schneider, 1987). Work relationships comprise a major component of one's work life and can have both positive and negative outcomes (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005; Eby & Allen, 2012). Relationships are the core of social exchange theory, and in the context of work, two important categories of relationships are with supervisors and coworkers. These relationships are important sources of social support and approval. Research by Gallup has identified having supportive relationships as one of the 12 most important work conditions leading to employee satisfaction and engagement (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999). Interpersonal relationships at work are unique and develop within the context of the organization. Additionally, individuals often personify an organization based on the characteristics of important relationships within that organization (Levinson, 1965). Therefore, relationships with coworkers and supervisors can be representative of an employee's relationship with the organization and are considered context-specific predictors.

Research has consistently found connections between supportive relationships and withdrawal attitudes and behaviors. Coworkers can provide valuable rewards like information, aid, and support (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008). In emotionally demanding jobs, supportive relationship can offset stress by providing an outlet to voice frustrations and provide affirmation of worth (Leana & Feldman, 1988). Supportive coworker relationships have been found to be negatively related to turnover intentions, both in a meta-analytic review (Ng & Sorensen, 2008) and a study of the SAT profession specifically (Ducharme, et al., 2008). The relationship between coworker relationships and actual turnover has also been examined in several meta-

analyses. Coworker relationships were either examined in terms of support from coworkers (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008) or satisfaction with the relationships (Griffeth, et al., 2000; Hom & Griffeth, 1994). Measures of coworker relationships were significant predictors of turnover in all three meta-analyses, but the effect sizes were weak. It is possible that these findings were impacted by the fact that these studies did non separate voluntary from involuntary turnover. Additionally, the current study proposes that the relationship between coworker support and turnover will be found to be stronger with looking at voluntary *organizational* turnover since relationships are context-specific.

The role of the leader is especially important in the study of turnover. In Branham's (2005) study on the reasons employees voluntarily left their jobs, he found the influence of the supervisor on people's decision to quit was greater than any manager estimated. Of the 95% of turnover that potentially could have been avoided, over 70% of the reasons given were factors controllable by the direct supervisor. Other research supports Branham's findings. The quality of the relationship with one's supervisor, which encompasses satisfaction with the relationship, perceived mutual benefits, and relational depth (Allen & Eby, 2003), was found to be significantly negatively correlated with turnover intentions in a meta-analysis (Eby et al., 2012). Ng and Sorenson (2008) found a significant meta-analytic correlation between supervisor support and turnover intentions. The two meta-analyses by Hom, Griffeth and colleagues found significant negative relationships between supervisor satisfaction and turnover behavior (Griffeth, et al., 2000; Hom & Griffeth, 1994). These effects were small, but these meta-analyses did not focus specifically on voluntary turnover. It is anticipated that these effects will be stronger when the focus is on voluntary organizational turnover. In all, these findings point to the importance of relationships in the turnover decision process.

There is some initial support for the argument that coworker and supervisor relationships will be more strongly related to organizational turnover than professional turnover. One of the few studies that attempted to tease apart different predictors of turnover based on post-departure destination looked at employees' perceptions of their supervisor's competence and concern for his or her subordinates (Fields, et al., 2005). These two factors were significant negative predictors of turnover for those who ended up in a similar job in a different company (organizational turnover) but not for those who ended up in a different job in a different organization (similar to professional turnover), although whether it was a voluntary or involuntary departure was not considered. Similarly, a study examining intentions to leave either the organizational or the professional found that ratings of leadership quality were related to organizational turnover intent but not professional turnover intent (Simon, et al., 2010). Therefore, it is hypothesized that both coworker support and supervisor relationship quality will be more predictive of voluntary organizational turnover than voluntary professional turnover.

Hypothesis 2a: People who voluntarily leave their organizations will report significantly lower levels of coworker support than people who do not turn over.

Hypothesis 2b: People who voluntarily leave their organizations will report significantly lower levels of coworker support than people who change professions.

Hypothesis 3a: People who voluntarily leave their organizations will report significantly lower levels of supervisor relationship quality than people who do not turn over.

Hypothesis 3b. People who voluntarily leave their organizations will report significantly lower levels of supervisor relationship quality than people who change professions.

Role overload. The antecedents discussed up to this point are rewards (support from the organization and satisfying relationships with coworkers and supervisors) that most employees

expect to receive in exchange for what they invest. For this last context-specific predictor, we consider what happens when employees find themselves in situations where they are being asked to make more investments than what they feel they can handle. In other words, the exchange relationship is unbalanced. In SET, it is recognized that the investments made by one party typically have some cost associated with them, but the person is willing to incur that cost in the expectation that they will be rewarded in turn. "Individuals must be compensated for social rewards lest they cease to supply them, because they incur costs by doing so" (Blau, 1964, pp. 314-315). The relationship begins to lose its appeal when a person feels that he or she is investing more than receiving and an imbalance is experienced.

One such feeling of imbalance is role overload. This form of role stress can result when the demands and obligations of a role outweigh the availability of adequate resources (Ortqvist & Wincent, 2006). It is often felt when an employee experiences demands from multiple sources, such as both the organization and clients (Jones, Chonko, Rangarajan, & Roberts, 2007). Role stress, and specifically role overload, has been linked to employee turnover intentions and behavior. Numerous studies and meta-analyses have found a modest positive correlation between role overload and turnover intentions (Bartunek & Reynolds, 1983; Jones, et al., 2007; Ortqvist & Wincent, 2006), as well as overall turnover behavior (Griffeth, et al., 2000; Hom & Griffeth, 1994). One explanation for the relationship between role overload and turnover is that detachment from the source of the stress may be the best way to handle it (Jones, et al., 2007).

While it may be common for workloads to be high across organizations in the SAT field, it is hypothesized that these characteristics are more likely to be ascribed to the organization and its agents rather than to the profession. The amount of work given to an employee is determined by the policies and procedures of the organization, under the control of the supervisor, and

dependent on the current level of clients and staff. For instance, an organization may take on more clients than the staff feels it can handle because the organization is trying to increase revenue. If a treatment center is temporarily (or continually) understaffed due to the high turnover rates, remaining counselors are often asked to take on the extra clients. Additionally, the amount of paperwork required throughout the course of a client's treatment program is determined by the standards and procedures of that organization. Because these specific demands are being asked by the organization and its agents, role overload is considered a context-specific predictor of turnover.

Hypothesis 4a: People who leave their organizations voluntarily will report significantly higher levels role overload than people who do not turn over.

Hypothesis 4b: People who leave their organizations will report significantly higher levels of role overload than people who change professions.

Context-Generic Antecedents of Turnover

Just as people seek social rewards from their organization and its agents, they also seek social rewards from their profession. One broad category of desired social rewards is quality of life (Carless & Bernath, 2007). People want to enjoy what they do at work as well as what they do outside of work. Theoretical and empirical work on the topic of career change has looked at sources of professional discontent. Two of the basic sources of discontent include dissatisfaction with the type of work being done as well as emotional strain (Blau, 2007; Rhodes & Doering, 1983; Teixeira & Gomes, 2000). In professional occupations, the nature of the work and the emotional demands it brings are not likely to change much across organizations. As such, the antecedents of professional turnover likely go beyond the characteristics of the current work environment to those issues that are more pervasive across the profession. Therefore, the two

context-generic predictors of professional turnover that are of interest in this study are intrinsic job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion.

Intrinsic job satisfaction. As discussed above, people want more from their work than a paycheck or title; they are looking for a sense of satisfaction with the work that they are doing. Therefore, a feeling of satisfaction has been identified as a key psychological reward that people seek from their work (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). In this way, it can be viewed as a value-related intangible reward provided by the profession that binds the person to the macrostructure.

Job satisfaction is a core component of most models of turnover and is one of the most common antecedents studied. The construct of job satisfaction has been defined and operationalized in many different ways. Sometimes it is measured as an overall appraisal of one's satisfaction with their work in general, whereas sometimes is it measured in regards to very specific components of the current job. The job satisfaction that is under consideration in this study refers to intrinsic satisfaction with the type of work that is being done. For someone working in a professional role, the type of work that is done is likely to be relatively similar no matter in which organization it is being performed. Operationalized in this way, intrinsic job satisfaction is generalizable to the profession as a whole rather than the specific organization and is thought to be a context-generic factor that will impact the decision to stay in or leave a profession.

When the job satisfaction-turnover relationship has been meta-analyzed (with multiple measures and operationalizations of job satisfaction being considered simultaneously), results show that job satisfaction is indeed a significant predictor of undifferentiated turnover (Griffeth, et al., 2000; Tett & Meyer, 1993). These studies also found evidence of moderators due to high amounts of unexplained variance. Unfortunately, these studies did not restrict the criterion to

voluntary turnover and did not differentiate organizational versus professional turnover. In addition, in meta-analytic studies, the various measures of job satisfaction are often clustered together, losing the congruence between the attitude and the behavior. Ideally, the referent of the job satisfaction scale (i.e. satisfaction with the work itself vs. satisfaction with pay or working conditions) should correspond with the type of turnover (Blau, 2007). Following this logic, it is expected that intrinsic job satisfaction will predict voluntary professional turnover.

The argument that the correspondence between satisfaction measures and turnover type matters has some support in the literature. In one of the few studies that has directly tested the relationship between job satisfaction and both voluntary organizational and professional turnover, facet job satisfaction (asking about aspects of the specific job and organization) was more strongly correlated with organizational change than professional change (Blau, 2007). Furthermore, another study found that people who change professions scored lower on a more general work satisfaction scale than people who changed organizations (Wright & Bonett, 1991).

Other studies that have investigated the relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and turnover intent found significant results. Carless and Bernath (2007) found that intrinsic job satisfaction was the strongest predictor of intent to leave the profession. Another study found that intrinsic job satisfaction not only had the strongest relationship with professional turnover intent, but this relationship was stronger than that of the organization-specific antecedents with professional turnover intent, including support relationships and leadership quality (van der Heijden, et al., 2009).

All of this research lends support to the hypothesis that intrinsic satisfaction with the type of work is context-generic factor that will impact the decision to stay in or leave a profession. Because the measure of job satisfaction used in this study focused on the nature of the work and

professional turnover are congruent in regards to target level (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977), the following hypotheses are made.

Hypothesis 5a: People who voluntarily leave their professions will report significantly lower levels of intrinsic job satisfaction than people who do not turn over.

Hypothesis 5b: People who voluntarily leave their professions will report significantly lower levels of intrinsic job satisfaction than people who change organizations.

Burnout. As discussed previously, the rule of reciprocity governs exchange relationships (Blau, 1964). People expect to be rewarded to the extent that they are investing. Imbalances in the exchange relationship can have negative consequences if a person that feels like he or she is giving more than receiving. A potential result of a continual imbalance is burnout (Schaufeli, 2006; Smets, Visser, Oort, Schaufeli, & de Haes, 2004). Emotional exhaustion is a core component of burnout and is characterized by the depletion of emotional resources, leaving the individual feeling tired and emotionally drained (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Smets, et al., 2004). In other words, the individual may feel that he or she has nothing left to give. Burnout, and emotional exhaustion specifically, has been found to be a significant predictor of turnover intention and behavior (Lee & Ashforth, 1996).

In human service professions, including SAT, emotional exhaustion is a common problem (Ducharme, et al., 2008; Paris & Hoge, 2010). These professionals make major emotional investments in their work by spending much of their time helping individuals who are struggling with addictions as well as other psychological and behavioral problems. This can be taxing on the emotional health of the treatment professional and can lead to feelings of burnout. Emotional exhaustion is often a result of the nature of the work itself rather than something unique to an organization. Despite some differences in treatment approach and clientele across

organizations in the SAT field, the emotional demands of this type of work will not vary much from organization to organization. In other words, "if employees perceive that changing jobs but remaining in the same occupation will continue their basic job duties, they may view simply changing jobs as going 'from the frying pan to the fire'" (Blau, 2007, p. 138). Therefore, it is expected to be more closely related to voluntary professional turnover than organizational turnover.

Previous research has shown that emotional exhaustion is significantly related to both organizational and professional turnover intent and behavior (Blau, 2007; Doering & Rhodes, 1989; Lloyd, King, & Chenoweth, 2002). Within the SAT profession specifically, two studies found that emotional exhaustion was positively related to organizational turnover intentions, but this study did not look at professional turnover intentions (Ducharme, et al., 2008; Knudsen, Ducharme, & Roman, 2006). Other research has shown that burnout has a stronger association with intent to leave the profession (nursing) than intent to leave the organization, although both relationships were statistically significant (Simon, et al., 2010). When looking at actual turnover behavior, Blau (2007) found that emotional exhaustion was predictive of both voluntary professional and organizational turnover. Because the emotional demands are a characteristic of the profession in general, emotional exhaustion is proposed to be a context-generalizable factor more strongly related to professional turnover than organizational turnover.

Hypothesis 6a: People who voluntarily leave their professions will report significantly higher levels emotional exhaustion than people who do not turn over.

Hypothesis 6b: People who voluntarily leave their professions will report significantly higher levels of emotional exhaustion than people who change organizations.

Qualitative Investigation of Reasons for Turnover

Considerable research has attempted to identify a parsimonious yet generalizable set of predictors or pattern of decision-making that explains the most variance in turnover. By limiting the study of turnover to quantifiable variables that are identified by the researchers a priori, it is possible that some more nuanced reasons for leaving that differentiate organizational and professional turnover have been overlooked. Along these same lines, a criticism of existing research on turnover is that studies emphasize prediction over understanding (Morrell & Arnold, 2007). Although there is certainly value in trying to identify parsimonious models to predict employee turnover, there is also value in qualitative approaches when trying to gain understanding of this complex behavior. To this end, the current study utilizes both predictive quantitative data as well as retrospective qualitative data to gain a more complete understanding of the turnover process.

It is not uncommon for a company to conduct exit interviews with employees to determine why they chose to leave. This information can then be used to identify any systemic issues that might result in others leaving as well. A study on SAT organizations reviewed the reasons organizations had on file as to why employees left (Eby, et al., 2010). These reasons were broken down into two main classifications: job and personal factors, with most reasons being related to the job. More specifically, by far the most common reason for departure recorded by organizations was a new job or other opportunity. While it is likely accurate that these employees left when they found another opportunity, there was no explanation about *why* these people sought out these new opportunities.

Unfortunately, research has shown an incongruence between the reasons for turnover given to a former employer compared to reasons given anonymously to third party researchers

(Campion, 1991). More socially desirable reasons are likely given to employers so as to not burn any bridges for future references (Hom & Griffeth, 1994). For example, a study by Campion (1991) compared employee self-reports with information provided from personnel files and supervisor reports on the reasons for turnover. The organizational agents were much more likely to report that the person left for reasons such as higher salary, a better opportunity, personal factors, or relocation. On the other hand, employees were more likely to mention health, lack of promotion, or dissatisfaction with the work schedule, supervisor, or working conditions. In other words, the organizational agents reported reasons that were more general (e.g. personal reasons) or unrelated to the organization (e.g. relocation, retirement) whereas the employees were more likely to mention dissatisfaction with specific aspects of the environment (e.g. schedule, supervisor, promotional opportunities). These findings highlight the importance of improving the understanding of organizational leaders about the reasons people are choosing to leave their organization. This will allow for the creation of retention plans that have a better chance of making an impact. It also reinforces the importance of getting turnover information directly from the employees through a third party rather than relying on an organizational report of the reasons for turnover (Mobley, 1982). This type of information will help answer the question posed above: *why are these employees leaving their organizations for other opportunities?* To address this need for richer understanding of turnover, two research questions will be addressed:

Research Question 1: What are the most common reasons for voluntary turnover that are given by substance abuse treatment professionals?

Research Question 2: What differences exist in the reasons given for voluntary turnover between those who changed organizations and those who changed professions?

In sum, this study seeks to enhance the understanding and prediction of turnover in two main ways. First, predictors of organizational and professional turnover will be investigated through the use of quantitative survey data to determine they are differentially related to these distinct outcomes. Secondly, qualitative analyses may shed light into additional unique predictors of organizational and professional turnover.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Sample

The sample for this study came from substance abuse counselors and supervisors working at various Community Treatment Programs (CTPs) across the United States. A wide range of treatment programs was included in this study. Quantitative survey data was collected for three consecutive years, and qualitative interview data was collected also collected for three years starting one year after the initial survey administration. Only the survey data from the year immediately prior to turnover was used for those who left the organization. These three years of data were combined to create a larger sample (i.e., survey data from one point in time, interview data from one year later). Survey data for those identified as staying in the organization were taken from those employees who completed the survey in both years two and three (using the data from year two in the analyses). This ensured that they remained for at least one year and had not left their organization by the time this study was completed.

Overall, 1919 substance abuse professionals completed the survey during at least one year of data collection. The survey response rates were 82%, 77%, and 76%, respectively, for the three years of survey data collection for an overall response rate of 78%. There were 372 participants who took the survey during both year two and three, thus making up the group of those who stayed in the organization. Eight hundred and sixty-three people (45%) turned over during the course of the study, and 346 of them completed the exit interview to provide turnover destination data (interview response rate of 40%). Two hundred and sixty-three (76%) of the

people interviewed left voluntarily, and of those, 120 (46%) changed organizations and 99 (38%) changed professions. The remaining 44 voluntary leavers either did not provide information as to where they were after they left their organization or did not have survey data from the year prior to departure and therefore were not included in the sample. This left a final sample of 219 people who voluntarily turned over.

The final sample was made up of 467 (78.8%) counselors and 126 (21.2%) clinical supervisors. The average age was 43.42 years old. A majority of the sample was women (405; 68.3%) and Caucasian (398; 67.1%). Over half of the participants had a masters or professional degree (310; 52.3%) with another 24.1% having a college degree. Two hundred and fifteen (36.3%) of the participants were personally in recovery from a substance abuse addiction. Three hundred and thirty-six (56.7%) of the participants were certified or licensed as substance abuse professionals, and they made an average of $37,525 per year. On average, the participants had been in their profession for 11.06 years and had been in their current organization for 5.33 years.

<div align="center">Quantitative Procedure</div>

A researcher traveled to each location to administer the paper and pencil surveys used in the quantitative portion of this study. The survey took between an hour to an hour and a half to complete. The researcher gave a brief overview of the study and explained the survey process, stressing that participation was voluntary, and asked the participants to sign a consent form. To ensure confidentiality, the surveys were coded with numbers rather than names, and completed surveys were turned in directly to the researcher. CTP administration was not allowed access to completed surveys.

Qualitative Procedure

When completing the survey, participants were also asked to fill out a contact form if they were willing to participate in an exit interview if they left the organization for any reason during the next year. One year after the survey data was collected, the organization was asked to report which of the participants were still employed by their organization. Those who were no longer working with the organization were contacted via email to ask if they would be willing to participate in a thirty-minute phone interview. A member of the research team conducted the interviews, and participants were assured that no information they shared would be reported back to their previous organization at an individual level. Participants were asked a serious of yes-no questions and open-ended questions about various aspects of their departure from the organization. Participants who completed the interview were compensated $40 for their time. Most participants agreed to have their interview recorded, and a professional transcription company transcribed those interviews. Additionally, notes from the original interviews were retained and were used for those participants who did not want to be recorded.

These interviews were used to assess the voluntary nature of the departure, whether the turnover resulted in organization or profession change, and the reason for leaving. The author coded the first two variables. When the participant did not clearly identify whether or not they left voluntarily, information provided by the organization was referenced to clarify. Additionally, in some cases the participant was not able to provide a clear-cut response to whether or not they were still working in the SAT profession. Several of them moved to jobs that are still in the mental health field but are not solely focused in substance abuse. In these cases, if the participant was still providing therapeutic services to clients and did not indicate that they viewed this change as a departure from the profession, they were classified as changing organizations. If they

were no longer involved in the provision of therapeutic services to clients or if they identify this new job as a professional change, they were classified as changing professions. If someone was currently unemployed but actively seeking re-employment, the desired new job was used to determine the category they fell into. If there was no clear way to classify the type of change they made (or hope to make), they were removed from the sample.

Content analysis was used to analyze the reasons for leaving the organization. Multiple reasons for leaving the organization could be reported by each individual, and the unit of analysis was a meaningful thought. Two graduate students who were unaware of the aim of this study were trained on the process of content analysis and coded the reasons for turnover based on the guidelines suggested by Weber (1990) and Miles and Huberman (1994). They independently read through all of the interview segments and created an initial list of codes. Under the supervision of the researcher, they then compared lists and created an agreed upon list of codes. They then coded a subset of interviews from a different yet similar dataset to ensure consensus on the coding process. Once they had demonstrated an understanding of how to code the data, they coded the interviews based on this coding scheme. The team then gathered one more time to compare codes and reach final consensus. After independently coding all of the interviews, there was 97.0% agreement. All areas of disagreement were discussed until everyone was in agreement of the final coding. More discrete codes were then clustered together into more meaningful themes and subthemes.

<div align="center">Measures</div>

The following items were measured on the survey. All measures used a five-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). Survey questions are included in Appendix A.

Perceived organizational support. Eisenberger and colleagues' (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, & Lynch, 1997) measure of POS was used. This is an eight-item scale, and a sample item is "My organization really cares about my well-being." The coefficient alpha for this scale was .91.

Coworker support. The attachment subscale from Cutrona and Russell's (Cutrona & Russell, 1978) measure of coworker support was used. This scale has three items, and a sample item is "I feel a strong emotional bond with my co-workers." The coefficient alpha for this scale was .95.

Supervisor relationship quality. Counselors only were asked to report on the relationship with their clinical supervisor. Allen and Eby's (2003) four-item measure of relationship quality was used to assess the quality and effectiveness of the relationship. A sample item is "I am effectively utilized as a counselor by my clinical supervisor." The coefficient alpha for this scale was .90.

Role overload. Role overload was measured with a three-item scale that assessed how they felt about their current workload from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Cammann, Finchman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1979). A sample item is "I have too much work to do everything well." The coefficient alpha for this scale was .82.

Intrinsic job satisfaction. The 6-item "kind of work" subscale from Smith's (1976) Index of Organizational Reactions was adapted to assess the degree to which the participants are satisfied with the type of work that they do. A sample item is "The kind of work I do has a favorable influence on my overall attitude toward my job." The coefficient alpha for this scale was .82.

Emotional exhaustion. The emotional exhaustion subscale of the Maslach Burnout Inventory scale was used (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). This scale has nine items and taps into the emotional strain that someone feels as a result of their work. A sample item is "I feel emotionally drained from my work." The coefficient alpha for this scale was .92.

Responses to the interview questions were analyzed in order to gain information about the participants' departure from the organization. The opening of the interview as well as the relevant questions are provided in Appendix B.

Voluntary vs. involuntary. Participants were asked, "Did you leave [name of organization] voluntarily or were you let go by the center?" Data was coded 1 = voluntary turnover, 2 = involuntary turnover. If the employee did not give a definitive answer, organizational reports of the voluntariness of the departure were used.

Turnover. Participants were asked if they were still working in the substance abuse profession. If they were still in the SAT field, they were coded as organizational turnover (coded as 1). If they have left the profession completely, they were coded as professional turnover (coded as 2). Those who remained in their organizations were coded as stayers (coded as 0, not interviewed).

Reason for departure. In order to identify any additional reasons for turnover beyond what was included in the survey, participants were asked, "Please describe for me the main reasons you decided to leave [treatment center]?"

Controls. There are numerous other variables that could influence turnover in this population. In one of the few studies on professional turnover within the SAT field, it was found that certification and being in recovery were negatively related to turnover intentions (Rothrauff, et al., 2011). It was argued that these employees had more invested in the field, and therefore

more to lose by choosing to leave the profession. Organizational and professional tenure are indicators of how much time a person has invested in working for that organization or profession, respectively. This time spent may reduce an employee's likelihood to leave. Therefore, organizational and professional tenure were examined as possible controls as well. In addition to these human capital variables, job level (counselor vs. supervisor) was examined as a potential control variable. All control variables were all gathered from the survey data.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Quantitative Analyses

Correlations were computed between the control variables, the six predictor variables,

and three dummy-coded turnover criteria (stayers vs. organizational changers; stayers vs.

professional changers; organizational changers vs. professional changers). Results are reported in

Table 1. Because organizational and professional tenure were highly correlated ($r = .57$, $p < .001$)

and had similar correlations with the other control variables, the choice was made to only use

one of these variables. Organizational tenure was chosen over professional tenure because it was

slightly less correlated with the other control variables and because it was desired to have a

control variable that was at the organizational level. Additionally, job level was excluded

because it was significantly correlated with certification as well as the tenure variables and did

not show any unique relationships with the predictors or turnover variables. This resulted in

certification, recovery status, and organizational tenure as control variables.

To test for differences between any of the groups (stayers, organizational changers, and

professional changers), ANCOVAs (with the control variables entered as covariates) based on

the general linear model were conducted to test each study hypothesis. Because of the unequal

cell sizes, least squares adjusted means and Type III sums of squares were used.

The overall ANCOVA results (reported in Table 2) show significant differences based on

turnover type in POS ($F(2, 555) = 20.40$, $p < .01$), supervisor relationship quality ($F(2, 433) =$

10.23, $p < .01$), role overload ($F(2, 556) = 4.91$, $p < .01$), job satisfaction ($F(2, 556) = 11.04$, $p <$

.01), and emotional exhaustion ($F(2, 555) = 11.47$, $p < .01$). There was no significant difference in coworker support based on turnover type. Therefore hypotheses 2a and 2b were not supported.

To determine where significant differences exist, planned contrasts were conducted for each ANCOVA that yielded a statistically significant F-value. Adjusted means and planned contrast results reported in Table 3. Due to the number of tests of significance and thus an inflated Type 1 error rate, a Bonferroni correction based on the work of Hochberg and Tamhane (1987) was used. Rather than correcting for the total number of predictors (six), which will increase the Type 2 error rate, this approach makes corrections based on families of conceptually related predictors that are similar in content and purpose. In this study there are two families of predictors: context-specific and context-generalizable. Therefore, the critical *p*-value of the hypotheses was set at $p < .025$ (conventional $p < .05$/2 families $= p < .025$).

For hypotheses 1a, 3a, and 4a, it was hypothesized that people who changed organizations but remained in the SAT profession will be significantly different than those who stayed in their organization. POS was significantly lower among organizational changers ($M = 3.11$, $SE = .08$) than those who stayed in their organizations ($M = 3.60$, $SE = .04$). Supervisor relationship quality was also significantly lower for those who changed organizations ($M = 3.30$, $SE = .09$) and those who stayed ($M = 3.75$, $SE = .86$). Finally, there was a significant difference in role overload between organizational changers ($M = 3.50$, $SE = .09$) and stayers ($M = 3.17$, $SE = .05$). All of these differences were at the *p* < .01 level. These findings support hypotheses 1a, 3a, and 4a; those who voluntarily left their organizations reported lower POS and supervisor relationship quality and higher role overload than those who stayed.

Hypotheses 5a and 6a predicted differences in intrinsic job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion between those who stayed and those who left their professions completely. Planned

contrasts found significant differences in both variables ($p < .01$). Professional changers reported significantly lower job satisfaction (M = 3.68, SE = .07) and higher emotional exhaustion (M = 2.89, SE = .09) than those who remained (M = 4.03, SE = .04 for job satisfaction and M = 2.42, SE = .05 for emotional exhaustion). These differences were at the $p < .01$ level. Thus, hypotheses 5a and 6a were supported. Together with the stayers versus organizational changers contrast, these findings support previous research that has found that POS, supervisor relationship quality, role overload, job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion predict turnover.

The second set of hypothesis predicted that there would be differences between organizational and professional turnover on these six variables (hypotheses 1b, 2b, 3b, 4b, 5b, and 6b). Planned contrasts were used to examine mean differences between organizational changers and professional changers on each of the variables with a statistically significant F-value from the ANCOVA (all except coworker support; results reported in Table 3). None of the context-specific predictors showed a significant difference between those who left the organization and those who left the profession, however all of the mean differences were in the expected direction. There was a significant difference in job satisfaction with professional changers (M = 3.68, SE = .07) reporting lower job satisfaction than organizational changers (M = 3.88, SE = .06; $F(1, 556) = 5.05$). The difference in emotional exhaustion between professional changers (M = 2.89, SE = .09) and organizational changers (M = 2.64, SE = .08) was not significant with the adjusted alpha level, but the p-value was less than .05. Therefore, only hypothesis 5b was supported.

Qualitative Analyses

The exit interviews were content analyzed to categorize the reasons for turnover. The reasons given for why the participants left their organization fell into four contextual themes:

personal, interpersonal, organizational, and job factors. Within those themes, 12 unique subthemes were identified. Comments that did not fall clearly into one of those subthemes were classified under one of two "other" categories—one for organization-related comments and the other for general comments. A complete list of themes and subthemes and sample quotes is provided in Table 4. Across all interviews, 443 meaningful thoughts were identified and coded. Each participant reported an average of 2.02 (SD = 1.10) reasons for leaving with a range of one to six distinct reasons. A word count identified that the average answer to the question "What is the main reason you left [organization name]?" was 105.79 words (SD = 130.14, range = 1 to 957).

The first research question focused on the main reasons SAT professionals gave for why they left their jobs (see Table 5 for a breakdown of the frequencies of each theme and subtheme). At the broader theme-level, organizational factors were the most commonly given reasons (199, 44.92%), followed by job factors (99, 22.35%), personal factors (71, 16.03%), and interpersonal factors (62, 14.00%). Reasons that did not fall into any of those themes made up the last 2.71% (12) of comments. At the subtheme level, the most frequent reason given was related to pay and benefits (59, 13.32%). Other commonly reported reasons fell into the subthemes of heavy workloads and undesirable schedules (49, 11.06%), personal and family issues including relocation, illness, and having a baby (47, 10.61%), not feeling like the organization was supportive or just (40, 9.03%), and ideological differences with the practices or strategy of the organization (36, 8.13%).

All of the predictor variables investigated in the quantitative portion of this study were represented to some extent in the interviews. Factors that contributed to a negative social environment, including peers who complain a lot or are incompetent, hostility between

counseling and nursing staff, and discrimination were the sixth most frequently reported reason for leaving (35, 7.90%), followed closely by stress and burnout (32, 7.22%). Issues related to one's boss, including reports of the boss being critical, hostile, or incompetent, were less frequently reported, but still impacted several people's decision to leave (27, 6.09%). Eighteen people (4.06%) reported that they left because of the nature of work they were doing. Half of those reported that they did not enjoy the type of work they were doing, including the nature of the clients being seen, the treatment approach, or substance abuse in general. The other half not express dissatisfaction the work, but rather a desire to try something new in the field, such as moving from inpatient to outpatient, or working in a faith-based organization. These findings support the commonly studied antecedents of turnover, but also shed light on some other areas that have not been studied as much.

In line with the overall purpose of this study, the second research question targeted differences in reasons for turnover between those who changed organizations and those who left the substance abuse field completely. In regards to the number of reasons provided for leaving, those who left the profession provided significantly more reasons (M = 2.22, SD = 1.22) than those who changed organizations (M = 1.87, SD = 1.00) (t (191) = -2.28, p < .025). In order to determine if there was a difference in the frequency of the reasons given between these two groups, chi square tests were run. Stress and burnout were reported significantly more frequently by those who left the profession (21, 9.55%) than those who left the organization (11, 4.93%; $\chi^2(1)$ = 6.18, p < .025). Additionally, the subtheme of "other" reasons related to the organization, including communication, disorganization, and training, was reported significantly more frequently by those who left the profession (13, 5.91%) than those who left the organization (4,

1.79%, $\chi^2(1) = 7.77$, $p < .01$). There were no differences between the groups at the broader theme level.

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations.

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Certified[a]	0.58	0.49	--										
2. Recovery[b]	0.37	0.48	.24**	--									
3. Org Ten[c]	5.33	6.34	.38**	.09*	--								
4. Prof Ten[c]	11.06	8.91	.40**	.11**	.57**	--							
5. Job Level[d]	1.21	0.41	.26**	-.07	.38**	.41**	--						
6. POS	3.43	0.84	-.06	.00	.08*	.01	.13**	(.91)					
7. Coworker Support	3.67	0.95	-.03	.03	.05	-.03	.01	.29**	(.95)				
8. Supervisor Relationship	3.58	0.89	-.11*	-.04	.02	-.01	--	.52**	.35**	(.90)			
9. Role Overload	3.25	0.99	-.02	.01	-.03	.01	-.01	-.39**	-.10*	-.23**	(.82)		
10. Job Satisfaction	3.94	0.66	.04	.10*	.09*	.12**	.13**	.47**	.22**	.34**	-.42**	(.82)	
11. Emotional Exhaustion	2.55	0.86	-.04	-.04	-.11**	-.09*	-.08	-.43**	-.13**	-.36**	.55**	-.61**	(.92)
12. Org TO[e]	0.24	0.43	-.08	-.06	-.24**	-.14**	-.09	-.25**	-.05	-.21**	.14**	-.11*	.11*
13. Prof TO[f]	0.21	0.41	-.28**	-.18*	-.28**	-.28**	-.18**	-.22**	-.12**	-.13*	.07	-.23**	.23**
14. Org v Prof TO[g]	0.45	0.50	-.23**	-.16*	-.11	-.13	-.14**	.03	-.09	.08	-.08	-.15*	.16*

Note. N ranges from 190 – 592.

Reliabilities reported on the diagonal in ( ).

[a]Certified coded 0 = not certified, 1 = certified. [b]Recovery status coded 0 = not in recovery, 1 = in recovery [c]Organizational and professional tenure measured in years. [d]Job level coded 1 counselor, 2 = supervisor. [e]Organizational turnover coded 0 = stay, 1 = changed organizations but stayed in SAT. [f]Professonal turnover coded 0 = stay, 1 = changed professions. [g]Org v Prof coded 0 = organizational turnover, 1 = professional turnover.

* *p* < .05. ** *p* < .01.

Table 2

Analysis of Covariance Results.

	SS	df	Mean Square	F
POS				
Certified	5.63	1	5.63	8.6**
Recovery Status	.14	1	.14	.21
Organizational Tenure	.74	1	074	1.14
Turnover Type	26.69	2	13.34	20.40**
error	362.94	555	.65	
Coworker Support				
Certified	2.50	1	2.05	2.82
Recovery Status	.18	1	.18	.20
Organizational Tenure	.78	1	.78	.88
Turnover Type	4.78	2	2.39	2.70
error	493.40	556		
Supervisor Relationship Quality				
Certified	5.04	1	5.04	6.63*
Recovery Status	.24	1	.23	.32
Organizational Tenure	.01	1	.01	.01
Turnover Type	15.54	2	7.77	10.23**
error	328.70	433	.76	
Role Overload				
Certified	.01	1	.01	.01
Recovery Status	.33	1	.33	.34
Organizational Tenure	.18	1	.18	.19
Turnover Type	9.51	2	4.76	4.91**
error	538.861	556	.97	
Job Satisfaction				
Certified	.42	1	.42	1.04
Recovery Status	1.38	1	1.38	3.39
Organizational Tenure	.29	1	.29	.72
Turnover Type	8.99	2	4.50	11.04**
error	266.39	556		
Emotional Exhaustion				
Certified	.74	1	.74	1.07
Recovery Status	.06	1	.06	.08
Organizational Tenure	.89	1	.89	1.28
Turnover Type	15.99	2	7.99	11.47**
error	368.87	555	.70	

* $p < .025$. **$p < .01$.

Table 3

Adjusted Means and Standard Errors of Predictor Variables by Turnover Type with Contrasts.

	Stayers		Organizational Turnover		Professional Turnover		Stayers vs. Changers[a]	Organizational vs. Professional Changers
	Adj. Mean	SE	Adj. Mean	SE	Adj. Mean	SE	F-value	F-value
Context-Specific								
Perceived Organizational Support	3.60	.04	3.11	.08	3.13	.09	29.77**	.04
Supervisor Relationship Quality	3.75	.06	3.30	.09	3.43	.10	17.85**	1.00
Role Overload	3.17	.05	3.50	.09	3.34	.10	9.47**	1.40
Context-Generic								
Job Satisfaction	4.03	.04	3.88	.06	3.68	.07	21.09**	5.05*
Emotional Exhaustion	2.42	.05	2.64	.08	2.89	.09	21.69**	4.86

Note. [a]*For context-specific predictors, planned contrast for stayers versus organizational changers. For context-generic predictors, planned contrasts for stayers versus professional changers.*

$* p < .025. ** p < .01.$

Table 4.

Reasons for Turnover with Examples.

ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS
Pay/Benefits
"First of all the pay is extremely low in comparison to the work load, also in comparison to other jobs that I've held and that are available in the field."   *"We had certain problems with trying to get benefits because I never got benefits. I didn't get my packet in a timely manner and then there was too many problems and I just felt like I need a– if I have to actually quit and then be rehired just to get my benefits it's ridiculous. They still hadn't done those in time, so I left."*
Perceived Organizational Support/ Justice
"I guess, I don't know, I feel like we weren't treated or appreciated very much there. We were basically told, "You're lucky you have a job." Just comments like that made it really difficult."   *"The main reason I truly left is because I was promised a raise and I didn't get it."*
Ideological Differences
"When they restructured, they went back and forth about whether or not we could do individual counseling at our clinic. We were forced to terminate several patients because they didn't meet the criteria for the clinic after it was restructured. I believe we were sending patients out that shouldn't have been discharged. And I really didn't agree with the changes that they made."   *"They expected the counselors to forge Medicount billing by saying that we saw clients for longer periods of time than we did and it was just expected of us to write down on these time sheets that we saw clients for, say, seventy minutes when the client would come in and speak for barely a few minutes and take off...And that was just expected of us and I had an ethical dilemma with that so I got out of it as soon as I could."*
Future with the Organization
"Because two of the three positions that I was in ... were eliminated by attrition. Other lay-offs were happening also, and I was concerned that my job would be eliminated."   *"Actually, I was an intern, so I had a one year appointment there, and so I chose to leave at the end of my internship. I might have been able to stay but my experience was over at that point."*   *"It's a lot of the fact of not being able to advance for a long period of time – people not anywhere close to retirement."*
Safety & Unpleasant Physical Environment
"The particular facility that I worked in had a lot of environmental toxins for me, because I have severe chemical allergies and I don't know if you know where I worked – it was the detox center…There was always sickness going around because the building was really small. The staff and the clients were cramped on top of each other."   *"The population is sort of a dangerous population. You're going to gang members' houses and stuff, and my family just felt that – and I felt – that that job was not really conducive to somebody with children."*

Other—Organization-Related

"Was trying to get license in marital and family therapy and no one would sign off on my hours towards getting that license; wouldn't get more pay once I had that license." "I felt like [my supervisor] wasn't doing a good job in trying to train me to work more effectively with the guys and to do the best I could as a case manager."

"Part of the challenge was that there just was not a lot of direction because of the arrangement there was. I was working for the University, but was contracted out to the prison, and so there was just a lot of mixed messages. It felt like neither of the two entities understood each other."

JOB FACTORS

Workload/Schedule

"I decided to leave instead of taking maternity leave because as a multi-systemic family therapist you're asked to be on call 24 hours a day for your clients, and the home based family therapy has really late hours."

"They'd eliminated a lot of staff in our department, and I was left to – rather than replacing those positions, I basically absorbed their responsibilities. Where we had started out with a staff of about three in admissions, it was down to just me. It was entirely too much work for one person I felt."

Stress/Burnout

"I was really burnt out, too, I have to say, for a couple reasons. Working with addiction, because like I said, I don't really think I'm the best person to deal with it even though I really like the clients. But it certainly got frustrating to spend hours and finally find a client the last bed in a halfway house and then find out later that they left two days after they got there. And then in a couple months they'd be back. So there was some feelings of frustration with it."

Nature of Work

"I was kind of tired of chemical dependency."

"I went to a residential treatment as opposed to outpatient treatment. And that's the one thing that I hadn't – that I haven't done. I wanted to give it a shot."

PERSONAL FACTORS

Personal and Family Issues

"I relocated back to New York."

"I needed to make some changes for my own sanity, mental health, goals in life."

"I just had given birth to twins. I wanted to spend more time with my kids since they were so young. I also had a daughter who was one-year difference in age. So I just wanted to be a mommy."

Change in Career/Work Status

"I left because I was going back to school to get my doctorate but I was willing to stay and work part-time and they said that that wouldn't be possible."

"The biggest reason was that I decided to pursue a degree in Speech Pathology."

"Well, basically I'm retired. I really have nothing against the organization, but basically I wanted to stop working so much….I actually still work for [Treatment Center] like half a day a week, not in that same job."

INTERPERSONAL ENVIRONMENT

Negative Social Environment
    "I just got to work, I was sitting there drinking my coffee, waiting – everybody behind the nurse's station, all my coworkers, were saying how they hated their job, how miserable the job was… Just kind of – it's depressing when everybody you work with says how miserable their job is and they want to quit. That was a big part of it."
    "I left because I felt discriminated against, and not in terms of color, but female. There was a supervisor there that really didn't treat the females very well, that was the bottom line."
Issues with Boss
    "I felt like the supervisors, at least my direct supervisors, were untrained and unqualified."
    "Because my boss' boss was extremely critical of my work and was unpleasable."
    "My supervisor, I would describe her as a bully."

OTHER-- MISCELLANEOUS

"I guess there was poor communication regarding the policies that would change almost daily regarding client care, regarding records management, pretty much every other level of the facility as well."
    "A lot of politics there. A lot of "do as I say and not as I do.'"
    "Colorado wasn't going to take any of my hours that I got from Texas, so they made me take all new classes again."

Table 5

Frequencies and Comparisons of Reasons for Leaving.

	All Turnover		Organizational Turnover		Professional Turnover	
	Count	Percent[a]	Count	Percent[a]	Count	Percent[a]
ORGANIATIONAL FACTORS	**199**	**44.92%**	**97**	**43.50%**	**102**	**46.36%**
Pay/Benefits	59	13.32%	25	11.21%	34	15.45%
POS/Justice	40	9.03%	24	10.76%	16	7.27%
Ideological Differences	36	8.13%	18	8.07%	18	8.18%
Future with Organization	31	7.00%	20	8.97%	11	5.00%
Other- Organizationally Related	17	3.84%	4	1.79%*	13	5.91%*
Safety/Physical Environment	16	3.61%	6	2.69%	10	4.55%
JOB FACTORS	**99**	**22.35%**	**52**	**23.32%**	**47**	**21.36%**
Workload/Schedule	49	11.06%	30	13.45%	19	8.64%
Stress/Burnout	32	7.22%	11	4.93%*	21	9.55%*
Nature of Work	18	4.06%	11	4.93%	7	3.18%
PERSONAL FACTORS	**71**	**16.03%**	**35**	**15.70%**	**36**	**16.36%**
Personal and Family Issues	47	10.61%	26	11.66%	21	9.55%
Change in Career/Work Status	24	5.42%	9	4.04%	15	6.82%
INTERPERSONAL FACTORS	**62**	**14.00%**	**36**	**16.14%**	**26**	**11.82%**
Negative Social Environment	35	7.90%	18	8.07%	17	7.73%
Boss Relationship	27	6.09%	18	8.07%	9	4.09%
OTHER- Miscellaneous	**12**	**2.71%**	**3**	**1.35%**	**9**	**4.09%**
Total Number of Reasons	443		223		220	
Number of People	218		119		99	
Average # Reasons per Person	2.02		1.87*		2.21*	
Average # Words per Person	105.79		106.39		105.03	

Note. [a]Percent of comments given for that group of participants.

*Significant difference *(p < .025)* between those who changed organizations and those who changed professions.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Researchers have been trying to understand and predict employee turnover for decades. Many great contributions have been made toward this end, but there are still many inconsistencies, and much is left to be understood. This study sought to approach turnover from a new angle by separating organizational from professional turnover. It was argued that all turnover is not necessarily equal, and therefore refining the turnover criterion by considering where the person goes after they leave may add more insight into this critical behavior (Fields, et al., 2005). To this end, both predictive quantitative data and retrospective qualitative data were evaluated for differential relationships with these two types of turnover. This study makes three main contributions to the literature. First, the use of two methods of data collection at two different points in time adds a richness to the study of turnover as it provides a more well-rounded assessment of the antecedents of turnover than either source of data could provide alone (Morrell & Arnold, 2007). Secondly, this study established relationships between predictors and the different types of voluntary turnover using both of these sources of data. Finally, the relationships between predictors and organizational and professional turnover were contrasted to identify where differences in these types of turnover exist. These findings, along with recommendations for future research and implications for both researchers and practitioners, will be discussed.

Prediction of Turnover Behavior from Attitudes

In line with the existing work on turnover, six frequently studied variables were used as predictors of turnover in this study: perceived organizational support, supervisor relationship quality, coworker support, role overload, intrinsic job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion. All six predictors were significantly related to at least one of the turnover variables. As anticipated, when comparing stayers to leavers, perceived organizational support, supervisor relationship quality, and role overload were significantly related to voluntary organizational turnover and intrinsic job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion were related to voluntary professional turnover. In addition to the hypothesized relationships, it was found that perceived organizational support and supervisor relationship quality were also correlated to professional turnover, and intrinsic job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion were also correlated to organizational turnover. Contrary to prediction, coworker support was significantly correlated with professional turnover but not organizational turnover. In support of the survey data, all six predictors were mentioned to varying degrees in the qualitative interviews as reasons why people left their organizations.

The unexpected finding that coworker support and organizational turnover were not significantly related deserves consideration. One possible explanation for the lack of association between coworker support and organizational turnover is based on the aspect of coworker relationships that was assessed. The scale of coworker support used in this study measured the sense of emotional closeness with coworkers. Higher scores on this measure indicate especially close relationships. Conversely, lower scores on this scale may not indicate problematic relationships or lack of support. In other words, the absence of good does not automatically imply the presence of bad. Negative coworker relationships are characterized by a negative

outcome for at least one member of the relationship (Griffeth, Stoverink, & Gardner, 2012). Of the exit interview comments related to peers, all of them addressed a negative interaction, whether it was harassment, incompetence, safety, or divisiveness. While there were comments about not being supported, they were always in reference to the supervisor or organization overall, not coworkers. Therefore, positive coworker support may not be as important of a predictor of turnover as these other supportive relationships or the presence of negative coworker exchanges. Future research should consider investigating the negative side of coworker relationships to see how this dimension of coworker relationships relates to organizational and professional turnover.

Interestingly, coworker support was significantly correlated to professional turnover, and post hoc ANCOVA analyses showed that there was a significant difference in level of coworker support between those who remained in their organizations and those who left the SAT profession. While the specific coworkers with whom an employee works are unique to the current organization, a person who has not worked in a lot of other SAT organizations might assume that this group of coworkers represents the general population of people who work in the SAT profession. If this is the case, then coworker support may be more context-generic rather than context-specific, leading to a stronger relationship with professional turnover. This relationship should be investigated further.

<div align="center">Additional Reasons for Turnover</div>

Another contribution of this study was the use of information from exit interviews to identify other variables that should be considered as predictors of voluntary turnover in future models of turnover, at least for the substance abuse profession. The results reported in the tables and thus far in this study have been in terms of the percent of all comments given. However,

since each participant could provide more than one reason, (they averaged 2.02 reasons per person) but they could only mention each reason once, it is worthwhile to also consider the percentage of people who mentioned the reasons. This will give an indication of how many people considered each factor in their decision to leave.

Insufficient pay and benefits were the most frequently reported reason for leaving. Fifty-nine comments were made about pay and benefits, which made up 13.32% of all comments. This means that 27.06% of the people who turned over mentioned pay or benefits as a main reason for leaving. Quite a few of these comments indicated people felt that the compensation did not match the amount of work they were being asked to do. One person explained it this way: "You can take more abuse if you're making a living wage." In several organizations, salaries or benefits were cut, so if the person were to stay, they would have to take a lower salary.

Pay and benefits were major issues for both organizational and professional turnover, but there was a difference in where pay ranked against the other reasons for these two groups. For organizational leavers, pay and benefits were the third most frequently cited reason for leaving, but for professional leavers, pay was number one, ranking higher than all interpersonal factors combined. Although there was not a statistically significant difference in these results, this may indicate that pay is a context-generic variable because low salaries are a problem across the whole field. The average salary for our sample was $37,525 which is slightly lower than the national average for substance abuse counselors of $38,560 as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2012). This national average is lower than other similar fields including mental health counseling and social work. Therefore, people who desire or need to make more money may have to look outside of substance abuse to do so.

As discussed previously, research has not found that pay is a strong predictor of turnover (Branham, 2005; Griffeth, et al., 2000), and the studies that have found relationships show weak or inconsistent results (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Vandenberghe & Tremblay, 2008). One reason for this might be that it is not the salary level (dollar amount) itself, but rather what that salary represents that matters to an individual (Tekleab, Bartol, & Liu, 2005). Satisfaction with pay has been linked to perceptions of organizational support and distributive and procedural justice, and the relationship between pay and turnover intent and behavior is mediated by these variables. (Tekleab, et al., 2005; Vandenberghe & Tremblay, 2008). In line with the tenets of SET, salary and pay increases can serve as an indication of the employee's worth to the organization, and if an employee is not compensated at a level considered fair, or if they feel they are giving more than they are receiving, they may no longer desire to continue that relationship. Additionally, if the pay is low and the person if not receiving other anticipated social rewards to make up for it, money becomes a more salient factor. When asked why they left their organizations, people may have mentioned pay because it is a more tangible explanation than what that money represents.

After pay and benefits, the next additional subtheme (i.e. not one of the six variables measured in the survey) to emerge was personal and family issues (47 comments, 10.61%). As explained in the unfolding model of turnover, people can take many different paths in their decision to leave the organization (Lee, et al., 1996). One such path is based in a pre-defined script that leads them to leave the organization despite how they feel about their current job. These scripts can include factors such as spouse relocation, health concerns, and pregnancy, and these were three of the most commonly cited reasons that fell under the personal and family subtheme.

Turnover decisions based on extraneous personal and family factors have been classified as unavoidable turnover (Abelson, 1987) and are the types of turnover which "no reasonable intervention would have prevented" (Dalton, et al., 1981, p. 719). On the other hand, avoidable turnover is, at least to some degree, within the organization's control. A studying comparing stayers, unavoidable leavers, and avoidable leavers found that, in many cases, unavoidable leavers were not significantly different from stayers (Abelson, 1987). On attitudinal variables as well as withdrawal cognitions, avoidable leavers were significantly different from both unavoidable leavers and stayers, but there was no difference between the unavoidable leavers and stayers. Additionally, the model that compared stayers to only avoidable leavers explained more variance in turnover than when all leavers were combined. The potential for similarity between stayers and people who left for unavoidable personal reasons was indicated by some of the interviewees who expressed that they would be willing to work at their organizational again if circumstances allowed.

One suggestion for future research, therefore, would be to take avoidability into consideration when measuring turnover. The similarities in the results for stayers and unavoidable leavers suggests that further classifying turnover by avoidability may result in more accurate estimates of the validity of antecedents in predicting turnover behavior. Hom and Griffeth (1994) further affirm that researchers should focus on those cases in which turnover is voluntary and avoidable as this is a "superior criterion" in testing models of turnover. Failure to do so can both overestimate the level of turnover in an organization and underestimate the relationship between turnover and the anticipated antecedents (Abelson, 1987; Dalton, et al., 1981). Unfortunately, avoidability could not be controlled for in this study because it was not assessed consistently across all participants.

A third reason for leaving that came up relatively frequently was ideological differences with the organization (36 comments, 8.13%). Some people expressed that they disagreed with the model of treatment being provided, particularly methadone treatment. One person expressed it this way: "It's the whole methadone modality that I really don't care much for. When I first was starting to do counseling I thought that it might be at least a viable treatment. But in the end, I came to the conclusion…that it isn't really any kind of a solution…. I think drug-free is the way it needs to be." Several people mentioned practices that they felt were unethical, including backdating files or billing for more services than were provided. A third type of comment that fell in this subtheme had to do with the way the organization was run from a management/ administration standpoint including the salaries of the top management and the structure of the organization. These reasons made up the fifth most common group of reasons for leaving their organization, and the comments were evenly split (18 comments each) between those who left the profession and those who stayed in SAT but changed organizations.

This theme is very similar to a popular stream of research on person-organization (PO) fit. PO fit has been defined as the "compatibility between people and the organizations in which they work" (Kristof, 1996) and has been found to have a consistent, moderate relationship with turnover (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006). Fit has been assessed in various different ways, but the most common type of fit considered is value congruence (Hoffman & Woehr, 2006). Most of the people who mentioned ideological differences mentioned specific differences that could be considered issues of value incongruence.

The relationship between value congruence and turnover is supported in the social exchange framework. In exchange relationship with larger entities such as an organization or a profession, value congruence becomes a mediating mechanism that binds these relationships

together since individual-to-individual relationships between all members are not possible (Blau, 1964). These shared values contribute to a sustainable identity and behavioral framework for the macrostructure that an individual can connect with. People are attracted to groups that hold similar values and goals and will invest in those relationships for the reward of being able to fulfill their values (Blau, 1964; Byrne, 1971; Schneider, 1987). For this reason, when these employees felt a discontent with how their organization was demonstrating their values (e.g. valuing profitability over quality client care, advocating for methadone treatment rather than abstinence), they no longer felt the desire to remain a member of that group. The findings from this study confirm that value congruence is an important predictor of turnover that should be taken into consideration. Future work should further investigate how this plays out with both organizational and professional turnover.

<u>Distinguishing between Organizational and Professional Turnover</u>

Beyond confirming and identifying predictors of voluntary turnover, the crux of this study centered around distinguishing between voluntary organizational and professional turnover. Based on social exchange theory, the argument was made that people form relationships, be it with individuals, organizations, or professions, based on the anticipation that the association will be rewarding (Blau, 1964). If a person is not receiving the anticipated rewards, or if the costs outweigh the benefits, he or she may choose to disassociate from that relationship and find one that is thought to be more rewarding. Therefore, variables that reflect rewards or costs that are specifically related to the current organization, whether it be the organization itself, the people in it, or the tasks that are required, were hypothesized to be more closely related with voluntary organizational turnover. Conversely, variables that reflect rewards

or costs that would be similar across organizations within that profession were hypothesized to be more closely related to voluntary professional turnover.

The pattern of correlations showed initial support for the argument that context-specific and context-generic variables have different relationships with the different types of turnover. The context-specific predictors (except for coworker support) had stronger correlations with organizational turnover while the context-generic predictors had stronger correlations with professional turnover. This provides initial support for the classification of the variables used in this study.

The results of the ANCOVA analyses did not fully support the hypothesized differences between organizational and professional turnover. Five of the six predicts were significantly related to the type of turnover hypothesized when comparing people who left with people who stayed, but only intrinsic job satisfaction differentiated between the two groups of leavers. When comparing frequency of reasons reported in the exit interviews, burnout was the only subtheme that was significantly different between the turnover groups. An interesting pattern emerged from these results. The only two variables that distinguished between organizational and professional turnover in either the quantitative or qualitative data were both classified as context-generic predictors. Both will be discussed in turn, followed by a consideration as to why no differences were found with the context-specific variables.

Those who left the profession reported significantly lower intrinsic job satisfaction compared to those who left the organization but stayed in the field. Job satisfaction is at the core of many models of turnover and often as a predictor of voluntary organizational turnover. What is important to consider in studies of the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover is that job satisfaction can be measured in many different ways. In this study, the measure of job

satisfaction used addressed the general nature of the work being done ("The *kind of work* I do has a favorable influence on my overall attitude toward my job"). This type of measure is tapping more into the level of work that would be consistent across most jobs in the substance abuse field rather than specific to the organization. Therefore it was not surprising that people who left the profession all together scored lowest on this measure.

What was somewhat surprising was the lack of comments about job satisfaction that showed up in the exit interviews. Only 18 comments (4.06%) directly addressed some aspect of the work that was being done (the subtheme of "nature of work"), and of those, only half (9; 2.03%) of them explicitly expressed dissatisfaction. It may be that people do feel a sense of dissatisfaction before they leave which is why job satisfaction was a significant predictor in the quantitative analyses, but when asked about the main reason they left, they were more likely to mention a specific reason that was more likely "the straw that broke the camel's back." The few comments that expressed dissatisfaction mostly had to do with the nature of the clients being seen or the field in general (e.g. "They do substance abuse, and I realized that I really don't like the substance abuse field."). These comments were given more often by those who left the profession (6 comments) than those who left the field (3 comments). The other comments about the type of work did not so much express dissatisfaction as much as a desire to try something different (inpatient vs. outpatient). This latter category occurred more for those who left the organization (8 comments) than those who left the profession (1 comments). This difference between the two groups lends support to the importance of variable congruence. The first set of comments about dissatisfaction addressed more general aspects of the work that are consistent across the field. The latter set of comments dealt more with the specifics of the work being done at the current organization rather than the work of substance abuse treatment in general.

Unfortunately, tests for statistical differences at these finer-grained levels of distinction could not be conducted due to the low frequency of comments made. Future work on satisfaction and turnover should pay special attention to the congruence of the measures of satisfaction and turnover to see if unique relationships might be found between different measures of satisfaction (context-specific and context-generic) and different types of turnover.

In the qualitative analyses, emotional exhaustion was the only qualitative subtheme (other than "other organizational factors") that was significantly different between the two turnover groups. People who left the profession reported issues of stress and burnout (of which emotional exhaustion is a component) 21 times (9.59% of comments) and it was the third most frequently given reason. Since each person could only mention a particular reason one time, this means that 21.21% of the 99 people who left the profession reported stress and/or burnout as a primary reason for leaving. On the other hand, people who left the organization but not the profession mentioned stress and burnout only 11 times (4.95% of comments, mentioned by 9.24% of the 119 people). Emotional exhaustion and burnout clearly play a role in the turnover process, and it seems that people who experienced more burnout were more likely to find a new profession rather than continue in SAT in a different organization.

This difference was not replicated in the quantitative analyses. Emotional exhaustion was significantly higher for those who left the profession (M = 2.90, SD = 0.83) than those who did not turnover (M = 2.41, SD = 0.82), but it did not emerge as significantly different when comparing organizational to professional turnover ($p = .03$). A comparison of the adjusted group means shows professional leavers (M = 2.89, SE = .09) did report higher levels of emotional exhaustion than those who left just the organization (M = 2.64, SE = .08), but that difference did not reach the alpha level ($p = .025$) set for this study. Upon further investigation, it was found

that there was a significant difference between stayers and organizational changers on emotional exhaustion. This means that emotional exhaustion is a significant predictor of both types of turnover.

The argument was made that people with high levels of emotional exhaustion would be more likely to leave their professions than to leave their organization on the basis that the emotionally demanding nature of work in the SAT profession would be relatively similar across organizations within this profession. What was not accounted for was the heterogeneity that exists within this profession. While the nature of the work in most cases involves dealing with clients with additions to drugs and alcohol, this work can take place in a variety of contexts. Because changing professions is a bigger change which can be stressful in and of itself (Louis, 1980; Rhodes & Doering, 1993), people who are experiencing burnout may try changing certain facets of their work situation to see if things get better. For instance, some counselors may find that working with adolescents is difficult and decide to move to a different organization where they are working with adults. In other cases, hospital based centers might see a different type of client than a privately-funded center. Someone can also make the choice to leave their organization and start a private practice where they can work fewer hours and have more control over the types of clients they see. Situations similar to each of these were mentioned in the interviews, but the specific nature of the new job was not assessed, so a more in depth evaluation of this theory could not be made. As measured in the survey, emotional exhaustion did not separate organizational from professional turnover, but the interviews still suggest that those who left the profession report burnout as a main reason for leaving more than those of left the organization.

Contrary to the hypotheses, the context-specific predictors showed no significant differences across the turnover groups in either the quantitative or qualitative data. In an attempt to discover why there were no differences in the context-specific variables in the survey data, additional contrasts were conducted to see if these variables were significantly related to professional turnover as well as organizational turnover. All variables except for role overload were significantly lower for those who left the profession than those who stayed, but there were no differences in role overload between stayers and professional changers. POS and supervisor relationship quality were therefore significant predictors of both types of turnover, but the effect sizes for organizational turnover larger than for professional turnover. Additionally, despite the fact that coworker support only separated stayers from professional changers and role overload only separated stayers from organizational changers, the mean of the other group of leavers was in the middle (i.e. for role overload, $M = 3.17$, $SE = .05$ for stayers, $M = 3.34$, $SE = .10$ for professional changers, and $M = 3.50$, $SE = .09$ for organizational changers). In all of these cases, the stair-step like differences that existed between the turnover groups were not different enough to be statistically significant.

In regards to the qualitative data, an explanation for the lack of distinction between organizational and professional turnover may lie in the nature of the questions asked. The exit interviews utilized in this study captured a lot of rich information about why people chose to leave their organization. However, most of the reasons given could be classified as context-specific rather than context-generic. It is possible that the reason more differences between the groups did not emerge is because the question used in this study addressed why they left their organization specifically. This may have prompted them to provide more context-specific reasons than if the question addressed professional turnover directly or even a more general

question like "Why did you decide to leave?" Another way to gain a better understanding of why people are choosing to leave their profession would be to ask them not only why they left their current organization, but also why they left the profession. An assessment of why people chose to leave their professions would likely uncover more context-generic reasons for the change that can be used in future research.

<div align="center">Implications for Theory and Research</div>

The combined results of this study may indicate that these turnover behaviors are different but not necessarily independent of each other. It cannot be conclusively argued at this point that considering the turnover destination is irrelevant in the study of turnover. The pattern of results points to the existence of some differences between the two types of turnover, but the exact nature of these differences needs further clarification. The fact that the only variables that differentiated the two turnover groups were the context-generic variables of intrinsic job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion may support the argument made the career change literature that professional turnover is a tougher change to make (Rhodes & Doering, 1983; Rhodes & Doering, 1993). Changing professions involves not only finding a new job in a new organization with a new supervisor and new coworkers, but also the extra changes of learning a potentially completely new type of work. This can make professional turnover a more risky and costly change, which may be predicated on more extreme factors that are unlikely to be fixed by simply moving to a different organization. Not feeling satisfied with the type of work being done and feeling emotionally exhausted appear to be two of those factors.

The big question that remains is why the differences between the organizational and professional turnover groups on the four context-specific variables were not significant. Rather than just being predictive of organizational turnover, three of these variables were also related to

professional turnover. The boundaries between context-specific and context-generic variables may not be at distinct as originally thought. As discussed with coworker support, something that is specific to the current organization, such as peers, leaders, or policies, may also be associated with the larger profession. Just as a supervisor can serve as a representation of the organization (Levinson, 1965), aspects of the organization may serve as a representation of the profession as a whole, especially since the large professional macrostructure is more distal and less tangible. If this is true, then having a bad relationship with one's boss or not feeling supported by the organization may also serve as an indication of what the profession has to offer.

Another possible explanation is that these variables should not be considered independently, but rather that the relationships between the context-specific variables and turnover destination are moderated by job satisfaction or burnout. It may be that both types of predictors can contribute to the decision to leave an organization, but lower levels of job satisfaction and higher levels of emotional exhaustion affect the decision of where the person will go next. For example, in this study, POS was related to both organizational and professional turnover. If someone is not feeling supported by their organization, he or she is more likely to turnover. Where that person decides to go next, however, may be influenced by something else. If POS is low but job satisfaction is high, the person might be more likely to look for another job in the SAT profession, whereas if job satisfaction is also low, the may be more likely to leave the profession all together. Meta-analytic research has identified both job satisfaction and burnout as consequences of POS (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), so the connection between POS and these context-generic variables is quite possible. The role of job satisfaction and/or emotional exhaustion in the relationship between the context-specific variables and turnover are worth investigating further.

The relationship of the two turnover behaviors in the context of this study might also have reduced the likelihood of finding clear distinctions between organizational and professional change. In a professional occupations, both organizational and professional turnover usually involve leaving the current organization. While it is possible that a SAT professional could decide to change fields and still remain with their organization (e.g. become a nurse in a hospital based center, move to the business office, etc.), it is almost necessary to leave the organization in order to change professions. An unavoidable limitation of the current study is that everyone who left their profession also left their organization. In this way, the professional turnover variable is somewhat contaminated, which may have prevented the identification of any variables that are unique to organizational turnover. It would be valuable to this line of research if a similar study could be done in a profession where people can work in both organizations that just focus on their line of work (e.g. accountants in an accounting firm) as well as organizations with a large variety of professions represented (e.g. an accountant for a retail company). This would provide a purer measure of professional turnover.

<div align="center">Implications for Practitioners</div>

The findings of this study also have implications for practitioners. Organizations that are struggling with high turnover rates should pay attention to the social rewards they are providing their employees. Many of the predictors of turnover and reasons for leaving are within the control of the organization. Feeling supported by the organization, having a high quality relationship with one's supervisor, and not being asked to do more that what the employee thinks he or she can handle will likely reduce the chances a person will want to leave the organization. Further, helping an employee find satisfaction in the type of work being doing and monitoring the emotional health of the staff will help not only keep them in the organization but also in the

field. Since intrinsic job satisfaction is related to both organization and professional turnover, it might be valuable to the organization to provide job candidates with a realistic preview of the work that is involved in the job. Salary and benefits were frequently cited as reasons for leaving, but most people who enter the SAT profession know that the pay is low across the whole field. Therefore, offering valuable social rewards may compensate to some degree for the low salary that can be offered. Additionally, organizations should be mindful of the amount of work that they are asking their employees to manage as this was one of the most frequently mentioned reasons for leaving in the interviews and role overload was a significant predictor of organizational turnover.

Conclusion

This study makes several important contributions to the field. First, it continues the discussion that has just begun about the importance of destination in the study of voluntary turnover. The results indicate that variables can relate to organizational and professional turnover differently, although much is still left to be examined. Secondly, the importance of pay and value congruence to people in their decisions to leave an organization were uncovered in the exit interviews, along with the high frequency of people who leave for unavoidable personal reasons. Finally, intrinsic job satisfaction and burnout, both context-generic, differentially related to these two types of turnover, indicating that those who leave both the organization and the profession experience more extreme feelings of dissatisfaction and exhaustion. These variables will be important to keep in mind in any attempts to retain knowledge workers in their profession. While these findings are specific to the substance abuse profession, these implications may be generalizable to other professions as well. Hopefully, researchers will continue to pay attention to the turnover variable itself and not just continue to focus on the predictors.

REFERENCES

Abelson, M. A. (1987). Examination of avoidable and unavoidable turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*(3), 382-386. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.72.3.382

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin, 84*(5), 888-918. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.84.5.888

Allen, T. D., & Eby, L. T. (2003). Relationship effectiveness for mentors: Factors associated with learning and quality. *Journal of Management, 29*(4), 469-486. doi: 10.1016/s0149-2063(03)00021-7

Anand, S., Vidyarthi, P. R., Liden, R. C., & Rousseau, D. M. (2010). Good citizens in poor-quality relationships: Idiosyncratic deals as a substitute for relationship quality. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(5), 970-988. doi: 10.5465/amj.2010.54533176

Austin, J. T., & Villanova, P. (1992). The criterion problem: 1917-1992. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*(6), 836-874. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.77.6.836

Bartunek, J. M., & Reynolds, C. (1983). Boundary spanning and public accountant role stress. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 121*(1), 65-72.

Blau, G. (2000). Job, organizational, and professional context antecedents as predictors of intent for interrole work transitions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 56*(3), 330-345.

Blau, G. (2007). Does a corresponding set of variables for explaining voluntary organizational turnover transfer to explaining voluntary occupational. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 70*(1), 135-148. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2006.07.007

Blau, G. J. (1985). Relationship of extrinsic, intrinsic, and demographic predictors to various types of withdrawal behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70*(3), 442-450. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.70.3.442

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Branham, L. (2005). *The 7 hidden reasons employees leave: How to recognize the subtle signs and act before it's too late.* New York: AMACOM.

Buckingham, M., & Coffman, C. (1999). *First, break all the rules*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Bureau of Labor Statistics (2011). Job Openings and Labor Turnover- January 2011 Retrieved August 14, 2012, from www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/jolts_03112011.pdf

Bureau of Labor Statistics (2012). Substance abuse and behavioral disorder counselors. *Occupational Employment Statistics* Retrieved June 6, 2012, 2012, from http://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes211011.htm

Byrne, D. E. (1971). *The attraction paradigm*. New York,: Academic Press.

Cammann, C., Finchman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1979). *The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire. Unpublished Manuscript*. University of Michigan. Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Campion, M. A. (1991). Meaning and measurement of turnover: Comparison of alternative measures and recommendations for research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*(2), 199-212. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.76.2.199

Carless, S. A., & Bernath, L. (2007). Antecedents of Intent to Change Careers Among Psychologists. *Journal of Career Development, 33*(3), 183-200. doi: 10.1177/0894845306296646

Chiaburu, D. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(5), 1082-1103. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.1082

Cohen, A. (2000). The relationship between commitment forms and work outcomes: A comparison of three models. *Human Relations, 53*(3), 387-417. doi: 10.1177/0018726700533005

Cohen, A. (2003). *Multiple commitments in the workplace: An integrative approach*. Mahwah, NJ US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Cotton, J. L., & Tuttle, J. M. (1986). Employee turnover: A meta-analysis and review with implications for research. *Academy of Management Review, 11*(1), 55-70. doi: 10.2307/258331

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 874-900. doi: 10.1177/0149206305279602

Cutrona, C. E., & Russell, D. (1978). The provisions of social relationships and adaptation to stress. In W. H. Jones & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Advances in personal relationships* (Vol. 1). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Dalton, D. R., Krackhardt, D. M., & Porter, L. W. (1981). Functional turnover: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 66*(6), 716-721. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.66.6.716

Doering, M. M., & Rhodes, S. R. (1989). Changing careers: A qualitative study. *The Career Development Quarterly, 37*(4), 316-333.

Ducharme, L. J., Knudsen, H. K., & Roman, P. M. (2008). Emotional exhaustion and turnover intention in human service occupations: The protective role of coworker support. *Sociological Spectrum, 28*(1), 81-104.

Eby, L. T., Burk, H., & Maher, C. P. (2010). How serious of a problem is staff turnover in substance abuse treatment? A longitudinal study of actual turnover. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 39*(3), 264-271. doi: 10.1016/j.jsat.2010.06.009

Eby, L. T., & Rothrauff-Laschober, T. C. (2012). The relationship between perceptions of organizational functioning and voluntary counselor turnover: A four-wave longitudinal study. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 151-158. doi: 10.1016/j.jsat.2011.10.008

Eby, L. T. d. T., & Allen, T. D. (Eds.). (2012). *Personal relationships: The effect on employee attitudes, behavior, and well-being.* New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Eby, L. T. d. T., Allen, T. D., Hoffman, B. J., Baranik, L. E., Sauer, J. B., Baldwin, S., . . . Evans, S. C. (2012). An Interdisciplinary Meta-Analysis of the Potential Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences of Protege Perceptions of Mentoring. *Psychological Bulletin*. doi: 10.1037/a0029279

Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(5), 812-820. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.82.5.812

Fields, D., Dingman, M. E., Roman, P. M., & Blum, T. C. (2005). Exploring predictors of alternative job changes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 78*(1), 63-82. doi: 10.1348/096317904x22719

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and

    correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for

    the next millennium. *Journal of Management, 26*(3), 463-488. doi:

    10.1177/014920630002600305

Griffeth, R. W., Stoverink, A. C., & Gardner, R. G. (2012). Negative Coworker Exchanges. In L.

    T. Eby & T. D. Allen (Eds.), *Personal relationships: The effect on employee attitudes,*

    behavior, and well-being. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Harman, W. S., Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., Felps, W., & Owens, B. P. (2007). The Psychology

    of Voluntary Employee Turnover. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16*(1),

    51-54. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00474.x

Hochberg, Y., & Tamhane, A. C. (1987). *Multiple comparison procedures*. New York: Wiley.

Hoffman, B. J., & Woehr, D. J. (2006). A quantitative review of the relationship between person-

    organization fit and behavioral outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*(3), 389-

    399. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2005.08.003

Hom, P. W., & Griffeth, R. W. (1994). *Employee Turnover*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western.

Jansen, K. J., & Kristof-Brown, A. (2006). Toward a Multidimensional Theory of Person-

    Environment Fit. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 18*(2), 193-212.

Jones, E., Chonko, L., Rangarajan, D., & Roberts, J. (2007). The role of overload on job

    attitudes, turnover intentions, and salesperson performance. *Journal of Business*

    Research, 60(7), 663-671. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2007.02.014

Kirschenbaum, A., & Weisberg, J. (2002). Employee's turnover intentions and job destination

    choices. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(1), 109-125. doi: 10.1002/job.124

Knudsen, H. K., Ducharme, L. J., & Roman, P. M. (2006). Counselor emotional exhaustion and turnover intention in therapeutic communities. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 31*(2), 173-180.

Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49*(1), 1-49. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individual's fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology, 58*(2), 281-342. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x

Lawler, E. J. (1992). Affective attachments to nested groups: A choice-process theory. *American Sociological Review, 57*(3), 327-339. doi: 10.2307/2096239

Leana, C. R., & Feldman, D. C. (1988). Individual responses to job loss: Perceptions, reactions, and coping behaviors. *Journal of Management, 14*(3), 375-389.

Lee, R. T., & Ashforth, B. E. (1996). A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(2), 123-133. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.81.2.123

Lee, T. W., & Maurer, S. D. (1997). The retention of knowledge workers with the unfolding model of voluntary turnover. *Human Resource Management Review, 7*(3), 247-275. doi: 10.1016/s1053-4822(97)90008-5

Lee, T. W., Mitchell, T. R., Wise, L., & Fireman, S. (1996). An unfolding model of voluntary employee turnover. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(1), 5-36. doi: 10.2307/256629

Levinson, H. (1965). Reciprocation: The relationship between man and organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 9*(4), 370-390. doi: 10.2307/2391032

Lloyd, C., King, R., & Chenoweth, L. (2002). Social work, stress and burnout: A review. *Journal of Mental Health, 11*(3), 255-266. doi: 10.1080/09638230020023642

Louis, M. R. (1980). Career Transitions: Varieties and Commonalities. [Article]. *Academy of Management Review, 5*(3), 329-340. doi: 10.5465/amr.1980.4288836

Magenau, J. M., Martin, J. E., & Peterson, M. M. (1988). Dual and unilateral commitment among stewards and rank-and-file union members. *Academy of Management Journal, 31*(2), 359-376. doi: 10.2307/256552

March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations*. Oxford England: Wiley.

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2*, 99-113.

Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(4), 538-551. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.78.4.538

Micklethwait, J., & Wooldridge, A. (1996). *The witch doctors*. New York: Random House.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 62*(2), 237-240. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.62.2.237

Mobley, W. H. (1982). *Employee turnover: Causes, consequences, and control*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Morrell, K., & Arnold, J. (2007). Look after they leap: Illustrating the value of retrospective reports in employee turnover. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18*(9), 1683-1699.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-Organizational Linkages*. New York: Academic Press.

Ng, T. W. H., & Sorensen, K. L. (2008). Toward a further understanding of the relationships between perceptions of support and work attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Group & Organization Management, 33*(3), 243-268. doi: 10.1177/1059601107313307

O*NET. (2010). Summary report for: 21-1011.00 - Substance Abuse and Behavioral Disorder Counselors. Retrieved August 10, 2011, from O*NET Consortium Web site: http://online.onetcenter.org/link/summary/21-1011.00

Ortqvist, D., & Wincent, J. (2006). Prominent consequences of role stress: A meta-analytic review. *International Journal of Stress Management, 13*(4), 399-422. doi: 10.1037/1072-5245.13.4.399

Paris, M., Jr., & Hoge, M. A. (2010). Burnout in the mental health workforce: A review. *The Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research, 37*(4), 519-528. doi: 10.1007/s11414-009-9202-2

Parry, J. (2008). Intention to leave the profession: Antecedents and role in nurse turnover. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 64*(2), 157-167. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2008.04771.x

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the

 literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 698-714. doi: 10.1037/0021-

 9010.87.4.698

Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization:

 The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology,*

 86(5), 825-836. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.825

Rhodes, S. R., & Doering, M. (1983). An integrated model of career change. *Academy of*

 Management Review, 8(4), 631-639. doi: 10.2307/258264

Rhodes, S. R., & Doering, M. M. (1993). Intention to change careers: Determinants and process.

 The Career Development Quarterly, 42(1), 76-92.

Rothrauff, T. C., Abraham, A. J., Bride, B. E., & Roman, P. M. (2011). Occupational turnover

 intentions among substance abuse counselors. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment,*

 40(1), 67-76. doi: 10.1016/j.jsat.2010.08.008

Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). The Balance of Give and Take: Toward a Social Exchange Model of

 Burnout. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale, 19*(1), 87-131.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*(3), 437-453. doi:

 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1987.tb00609.x

Simon, M., Muller, B. H., & Hasselhorn, H. M. (2010). Leaving the organization or the

 profession a multilevel analysis of nurses intentions. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 66*(3),

 616-626. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2009.05204.x

Smets, E. M. A., Visser, M. R. M., Oort, F. J., Schaufeli, W. B., & de Haes, H. J. C. J. M.

 (2004). Perceived Inequity: Does It Explain Burnout Among Medical Specialists?

Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34(9), 1900-1918. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02592.x

Smith, J. F. (1976). Index of organizational reactions (IOR). *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 6*(54)*,* No 1265.

Teixeira, M. A. P., & Gomes, W. B. (2000). Autonomous career change among professionals: An empirical phenomenological study. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 31*(1), 78-96. doi: 10.1163/156916200746265

Tekleab, A. G., Bartol, K. M., & Liu, W. (2005). Is it pay levels or pay rises that matter to fairness and turnover? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(8), 899-921. doi: 10.1002/job.352

Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology, 46*(2), 259-293.

van der Heijden, B. I. J. M., van Dam, K., & Hasselhorn, H. M. (2009). Intention to leave nursing: The importance of interpersonal work context, work-home interference, and job satisfaction beyond the effect of occupational commitment. *The Career Development International, 14*(7), 616-635. doi: 10.1108/13620430911005681

Vandenberghe, C., & Tremblay, M. (2008). The role of pay satisfaction and organizational commitment in turnover intentions: A two-sample study. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 22*(3), 275-286. doi: 10.1007/s10869-008-9063-3

Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Wright, T. A., & Bonett, D. G. (1991). Growth coping, work satisfaction and turnover: A

    longitudinal study. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 6*(1), 133-145. doi:

    10.1007/bf01013689

APPENDIX A

SURVEY ITEMS

Please answer the following questions using the scale:
SD=Strongly Disagree, D=Disagree, N=Neither Agree nor Disagree, A=Agree, SA=Strongly agree

Perceived Organizational Support

___ My organization cares about my opinions.

___ My organization really cares about my well-being.

___ My organization strongly considers my goals and values.

___ Help is available from my organization when I have a problem.

___ My organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part.

___ If given the opportunity, my organization would take advantage of me. *

___ My organization shows very little concern for me. *

___ My organization is willing to help me if I need a special favor.

Co-worker Support: Attachment subscale

___ My co-workers and I have a close relationship that provides me with a sense of emotional well-being.

___ I feel a strong emotional bond with my co-workers.

___ I have a feeling of closeness with my co-workers.

Supervisor Relationship Quality

___ The relationship between my clinical supervisor and I is very effective.

___ I am effectively utilized as a counselor by my clinical supervisor.

___ My clinical supervisor and I enjoy a high-quality relationship.

___ Both my clinical supervisor and I benefit from our clinical supervisory relationship.

Role Overload

___ I have too much work to do to do everything well.

___ The amount of work I am asked to do is fair. *

___ I never seem to have enough time to get everything done.

Intrinsic Job Satisfaction

___ Work like mine discourages me from doing my best. *

___ When I finish a day's work I almost always feel like I have accomplished something
        worthwhile.

___ The kind of work I do has a favorable influence on my overall attitude toward my job.

___ I enjoy nearly all the things I do in my job.

___ Nearly all of the work that I do stirs up real enthusiasm on my part.

___ I really don't like the kind of work that I do. *

Burnout: Emotional Exhaustion

___ I feel emotionally drained from my work.

___ I feel used up at the end of the workday.

___ I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.

___ Working with people all day is really a strain for me.

___ I feel burned out from my work.

___ I feel frustrated by my job.

___ I feel I'm working too hard on my job.

___ Working with people directly puts too much stress on me.

___ I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.

*Items marked with an asterisk are reverse scored.

APPENDIX B

EXCERPTS FROM A SAMPLE EXIT INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Questions used in study are bolded.

Exit Interview Protocol for Counselors
Year 03

Background Information

- **Considering all of the jobs that you have held, how long have you worked in the substance abuse field?**
- Please tell me the different kinds of positions that you've had in the substance abuse field (e.g., clinical supervisor, outreach counselor, social worker). In providing this information, it may be helpful for you to tell me the 1ˢᵗ job that you had in the field of substance abuse followed by the 2ⁿᵈ, 3ʳᵈ, and so on.
- **How long did you work for _____[organization name]?**
- What was your job title prior to leaving?

General Information on Turnover

Now I am going to ask you some questions about why you are no longer working at
_____[organization name].

- **Did you leave _____[organization name] voluntarily or were you let go by the center?**

    ❖ If VOLUNTARY, then probe:
        ▪ "Would you consider working for [organization name] again?"
        ▪ "Why or why not?"
        If voluntary, skip to the section "Turnover from the Organization"

    ❖ If LET GO, then probe:
        ▪ "What was the documented reason for why you were let go?"
        ▪ "Is this documented reason accurate in your opinion?"
        ▪ "Why or why not?"
        If let go, skip to the section "Turnover from the Field"

TURNOVER FROM THE ORGANIZATION
(if voluntary)

- **Please describe for me the main reasons why you decided to leave
  _____[organization name].** (NOTE: probe for pay, working conditions,
  relationships at work, non-work reasons, personal reasons, burnout.)
- To what extent, if at all, did your relationship with your most recent clinical supervisor
  influence your decision to leave [organization name]? (NOTE: probe for critical positive and
  negative incidents with their clinical supervisor.)

TURNOVER FROM THE FIELD
(for both voluntary and involuntary)

- **Are you currently employed?**
  - ❖ If YES, then probe with the following 3 questions:
    - ▪ **"Are you working in the substance abuse field?"**
    - ▪ "Why or why not?"
    - ▪ "How long do you plan to stay in this occupational field?"
- (* Note to interviewer, if participant is in a different field, skip to the next question*)
  Continue to Information on Clinical Supervisory Relationship

  - ❖ If NO, then probe with the following 4 questions:
    - ▪ **"Are you currently seeking employment?"**
      - • If YES, then probe:
        - o **"Are you seeking employment in the field of   substance
          abuse?"**
        - o "Why or why not?"
      - • If NO, then probe:
        - o "Why aren't you looking for a new job right now?"
        - o "Do you plan on doing so in the future?"